Subspace Codes based on Graph Matchings, Ferrers Diagrams and Pending Blocks

Natalia Silberstein and Anna-Lena Trautmann

arXiv:1404.6723v2 [cs.IT] 7 May 2015

Abstract

This paper provides new constructions and lower bounds for subspace codes, using Ferrers diagram rank-metric codes from matchings of the complete graph and pending blocks. We present different constructions for constant dimension codes with minimum injection distance 2 or $k-1$, where k is the constant dimension. Furthermore, we present a construction of new codes from old codes for any minimum distance. Then we construct non-constant dimension codes from these codes. Some examples of codes obtained by these constructions are the largest known codes for the given parameters.

Index Terms

Constant dimension codes, Ferrers diagram rank-metric codes, graph matchings, Grassmannian, subspace codes.

I. Introduction

Let $\mathbb{F}_q$ be the finite field of size q. Given two integers k, n, such that $0 \leq k \leq n$, the set of all k-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ forms the Grassmannian over $\mathbb{F}_q$, denoted by $\mathcal{G}_q(k,n)$. It is well known that the cardinality of the Grassmannian is given by the *q-ary Gaussian coefficient*

$$|\mathcal{G}_q(k,n)| = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}_q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{q^{n-i}-1}{q^{k-i}-1}.$$

The set of all subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ is denoted by $\mathcal{P}_q(n)$. It holds that $\mathcal{P}_q(n) = \bigcup_{k=0}^{n} \mathcal{G}_q(k,n)$.

Both the *subspace distance*, defined as

$$d_S(X,Y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \dim X + \dim Y - 2\dim\big(X \cap Y\big), \tag{1}$$

and the *injection distance*, defined as

$$d_I(X,Y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{\dim X, \dim Y\} - \dim\big(X \cap Y\big), \tag{2}$$

for any two distinct subspaces X and Y in $\mathcal{P}_q(n)$, are metrics on $\mathcal{P}_q(n)$, and hence also on $\mathcal{G}_q(k,n)$. Note that for $X, Y \in \mathcal{G}_q(k,n)$ it holds that $d_S(X,Y) = 2d_I(X,Y)$.

We say that $\mathbb{C} \subseteq \mathcal{G}_q(k,n)$ is an $(n, M, d, k)_q$ *code in the Grassmannian*, or *constant-dimension code*, if $M = |\mathbb{C}|$ and the minimum injection distance of the code is $\min\{d_I(X,Y) \mid X, Y \in \mathbb{C}, X \neq Y\} = d$. Since $d_S(X,Y) = 2d_I(X,Y)$ for $X, Y \in \mathcal{G}_q(k,n)$, the minimum subspace distance of a constant-dimension code is twice the minimum injection distance of the code, thus one can equivalently use the subspace distance instead of the injection distance. Both notations, with the injection or with the subspace minimum distance, can be found in the literature. Furthermore, we call $\mathbb{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_q(n)$ an $(n, M, d)_q^S$ *subspace code*, or *projective space code*, if $M = |\mathbb{C}|$ and the minimum subspace distance of the code is $\min\{d_S(X,Y) \mid X, Y \in \mathbb{C}, X \neq Y\} = d$. If we use the injection distance instead of the

N. Silberstein is with the Department of Computer Science, Technion — Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel (email: natalys@cs.technion.ac.il).

A.-L. Trautmann is with the Institute of Mathematics, University of Zurich, Switzerland (email: anna-lena.trautmann@math.uzh.ch).

The first author is supported in part at the Technion by a Fine Fellowship.

The second author was partially supported by Forschungskredit of the University of Zurich, grant no. 57104103, and Swiss National Science Foundation Fellowship no. 147304.

Parts of this work were presented at ISIT 2013 in Istanbul, Turkey.

Copyright (c) 2014 IEEE.

subspace distance, we call $\mathbb{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_q(n)$ an $(n, M, d)_q^I$ subspace code. $A_q(n, d, k)$ will denote the maximum size of an $(n, M, d, k)_q$ code. By $A_q^*(n, d, k)$ we denote the size of the largest known $(n, M, d, k)_q$ code.

Subspace codes, and constant dimension codes in particular, have drawn significant attention in the last six years due to the work by Koetter and Kschischang [1], where they presented an application of such codes for error correction in random network coding. Constructions and bounds for constant dimension codes were given e.g. in [2]–[14]. For non-constant dimension codes some results can be found in [3], [5], [10], [15], [16].

One notes that the codes obtained by a simple construction based on *lifting* of *maximum rank distance* (MRD) codes [17] are almost optimal, i.e., asymptotically attain the known upper bounds [1], [5]. However, it is of interest to provide constructions of constant dimension codes which are larger than the lifted MRD codes. The first step in this direction was done in [3], where the *multilevel* construction was presented. This construction generalizes the lifted MRD codes construction by introducing a new family of rank-metric codes having a given shape of their codewords, namely, *Ferrers diagram rank-metric codes*. Further, some other constructions were presented in [2], [4], [5], [8]–[10], [13], [14]. Most of them provide constant dimension codes which contain a lifted MRD code as a subcode. Another type of constructions includes *orbit* or *cyclic* codes [5], [11], [18]. In [4], an upper bound on the cardinality of codes which contain a lifted MRD code was presented for some sets of parameters. For constant dimension $k = 3$ this bound was attained by using a generalization of a *pending dots* based construction, presented in [14].

In this paper, we continue with this direction of constructing large constant dimension codes which contain lifted MRD codes. We present new families of codes which have the largest known cardinality. The ideas for these constructions generalize the ideas presented in [3], [4], [14], [17].

First, we present new $(n, M, k-1, k)_q$ codes. These codes have the second largest possible injection distance $k-1$ (codes having the largest possible injection distance k are called *(partial) spread* codes and were considered in e.g. [12], [19], [20]). This case corresponds to the largest error correction, where the code cardinality can be improved. Our new codes are based on a two-dimensional generalization of pending dots, which we call *pending blocks*. Based on this approach we construct $(n, M, k-1, k)_q$ codes of cardinality

$$M = q^{2(n-k)} + \sum_{j=3}^{k-1} q^{2(n-\sum_{i=j}^{k} i)} + \left[\begin{array}{c} n - \frac{k^2+k-6}{2} \\ 2 \end{array} \right]_q . \tag{3}$$

Note that our new construction requires the field size q to be large enough, namely, $q^2 + q + 1 \geq n - \frac{k^2+k-6}{2}$. For smaller fields however, we slightly modify the construction and obtain codes that have almost the same cardinality as in (3).

Next, we focus on codes with the smallest non-trivial injection distance $d_I = 2$ (a code with the smallest possible distance $d_I = 1$ is the trivial code which contains the whole Grassmannian). It was shown in [4] that the gap between the cardinality of a lifted MRD code and the known upper bounds increases for smaller values of the minimum distance. Thus the minimum distance $d_I = 2$ corresponds to the case where the most significant improvement in the code cardinality is possible. We start with the multilevel construction of [3]. The main drawback of this construction is that it depends on the choice of the underlying constant weight code, but the best choice for such a code is still unknown. As a consequence, the cardinality of constant dimension codes obtained by the multilevel construction can not be written in a general form. We consider a specific choice of a constant weight code for the multilevel construction. This constant weight code is based on an one-factorization of a complete graph. The cardinality of the proposed $(n, M, 2, k)_q$ code can be derived and recursively gives the lower bound

$$A_q(n, 2, k) \;\geq\; \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n-2}{k} \rfloor - 1} \left(q^{(k-1)(n-ik)} + \frac{(q^{2(k-2)}-1)(q^{2(n-ik-1)}-1)}{(q^4-1)^2} q^{(k-3)(n-ik-2)+4} \right).$$

Then, we combine the idea of one-factorization based constant weight codes with the pending blocks construction and present a new family of $(n, M, 2, k)_q$ codes. Here, we use the one-factorization of a specific node labelling of the complete graph to provide codes with large cardinality.

In addition, we present a simple way to construct a new constant dimension code from an old one, with the same minimum distance. Surprisingly, for some parameters this construction provides the largest known codes (see Table II in Section VI). In particular, we derive the following recursive formula for the maximum cardinality of a constant dimension code, for any $n \geq 3k$ and $n \geq \Delta \geq k$:

$$A_q(n, d, k) \geq q^{\Delta(k-d+1)} A_q(n - \Delta, d, k) + A_q(\Delta, d, k).$$

We compare our constructions with other known constructions of constant dimension codes. For this we first analyze the difference of the cardinalities of our first three constructions with the cardinality formula of the *multicomponent construction* [8], [21], which is the largest known general construction with a closed cardinality formula. We show that the improvement of our construction compared to the multicomponent construction grows exponentially in the dimension n of the ambient space, for the relevant cases with $d = 2$ or $d = k - 1$. Next we compare our constructions for some parameter sets with the multilevel construction. This construction does not have a closed cardinality formula, but gives rise to the largest known constant dimension codes for many parameter sets. One can see that in some cases our constructions beat the multilevel construction, while in other cases they do not (see Tables I and II in Section VI).

Finally, we consider non-constant dimension codes. We use the constant dimension codes constructed in this paper as well as the largest codes from [3], [4] and apply the puncturing method [3] to obtain large codes for both the subspace and the injection metric.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II we introduce the necessary definitions and two known constructions which will be the starting points to our new constructions. In Section III we introduce the notation of pending blocks and present a construction for an $(n, M, k-1, k)_q$ code. In Section IV we consider properties of Ferrers diagrams arising from matchings of complete graphs and discuss the constructions for $(n, M, 2, k)_q$ codes. In Section V we present a construction of a new code from a given one. Section VI presents the comparison between the new codes obtained in the paper and some previously known codes. We consider constructions of non-constant dimension codes in Section VII and conclude with Section VIII.

II. Preliminaries and Related Work

In this section we briefly provide the definitions and previous results used in our constructions. More details can be found in [3], [4], [14].

A. Representations of Subspaces and Multilevel Construction

Let X be a k-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$. We represent X by the matrix $\mathrm{RE}(X)$ in reduced row echelon form, such that the rows of $\mathrm{RE}(X)$ form a basis of X. The *identifying vector* of X, denoted by $v(X)$, is the binary vector of length n and weight k, where the k *ones* of $v(X)$ are exactly in the positions where $\mathrm{RE}(X)$ has the leading coefficients (the pivots). All the binary vectors of length n and weight k can be considered as the identifying vectors of all the subspaces in $\mathcal{G}_q(k, n)$. These $\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}$ vectors partition $\mathcal{G}_q(k, n)$ into $\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}$ different classes, where each class, also called a *cell* of $\mathcal{G}_q(k, n)$, consists of all subspaces in $\mathcal{G}_q(k, n)$ with the same identifying vector.

Recall that the Hamming metric on $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ is defined as $d_H(u, v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{wt}(u - v)$, where $\mathrm{wt}(w)$ denotes the number of nonzero entries in the vector w. The asymmetric metric on $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ is defined as $d_{asym}(u, v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{N(u, v), N(v, u)\}$, where $N(u, v)$ denotes the number of coordinates i where $u_i = 1$ and $v_i = 0$ [10]. The following results are useful tools for constructions of subspace codes.

Proposition 1 ([3], [10], [16])**.** *For $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_q(n)$ we have*

- $d_S(X, Y) \geq d_H(v(X), v(Y))$,
- $d_I(X, Y) \geq d_{asym}(v(X), v(Y))$.

The *Ferrers tableaux form* of a subspace X, denoted by $\mathcal{F}(X)$, is obtained from $\mathrm{RE}(X)$ first by removing from each row of $\mathrm{RE}(X)$ the *zeros* to the left of the leading coefficient; and after that removing the columns which contain the leading coefficients. All the remaining entries are shifted to the right. The *Ferrers diagram* of X, denoted by $\mathcal{F}_X$, is obtained from $\mathcal{F}(X)$ by replacing the entries of $\mathcal{F}(X)$ with dots.

Given $\mathcal{F}(X)$, the unique corresponding subspace $X \in \mathcal{G}_q(k, n)$ can easily be found. Also given $v(X)$, the unique corresponding $\mathcal{F}_X$ can be found. When we fill the dots of a Ferrers diagram by elements of $\mathbb{F}_q$, we obtain a $\mathcal{F}(X)$ for some $X \in \mathcal{G}_q(k, n)$.

Example 2. Let X be the subspace in $\mathcal{G}_2(3, 7)$ with the following generator matrix in reduced row echelon form:

$$\mathrm{RE}(X) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbf{1} & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbf{1} & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} .$$

Its identifying vector is $v(X) = 1011000$, and its Ferrers tableaux form and Ferrers diagram are given by

$$\begin{array}{cccc} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{array}, \qquad \begin{array}{cccc} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \end{array},$$

respectively.

In the following we will consider Ferrers diagram rank-metric codes, which are closely related to constant dimension codes. For two $m \times \ell$ matrices A and B over $\mathbb{F}_q$ the *rank distance*, $d_R(A, B)$, is defined by

$$d_R(A, B) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{rank}(A - B).$$

Proposition 3 ([3], [10])**.** *For $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_q(n)$ we have that if $v(X) = v(Y)$ then*

- $d_S(X, Y) = 2d_R(\textit{RE}(X), \textit{RE}(Y))$,
- $d_I(X, Y) = d_R(\textit{RE}(X), \textit{RE}(Y))$.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a Ferrers diagram with m dots in the rightmost column and ℓ dots in the top row. A code $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{F}$ is an $[\mathcal{F}, \rho, d]$ *Ferrers diagram rank-metric (FDRM) code* if all codewords of $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{F}$ are $m \times \ell$ matrices in which all entries not in $\mathcal{F}$ are *zeros*, they form a linear subspace of dimension ρ of $\mathbb{F}_q^{m\times\ell}$, and for any two distinct codewords A and B, $d_R(A, B) \geq d$. If $\mathcal{F}$ is a rectangular $m \times \ell$ diagram with $m\ell$ dots then the FDRM code is a classical rank-metric code [22], [23]. The following theorem provides an upper bound on the cardinality of $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{F}$.

Theorem 4 ([3])**.** *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a Ferrers diagram and $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{F}$ the corresponding $[\mathcal{F}, \rho, d]$ FDRM code. Then $\rho \leq \min_i\{w_i\}$, where w_i is the number of dots in $\mathcal{F}$ which are not contained in the first i rows and the rightmost $d-1-i$ columns ($0 \leq i \leq d-1$).*

A code which attains the bound of Theorem 4 is called a *Ferrers diagram maximum rank distance (FDMRD) code*. Maximum rank distance (MRD) codes are a class of $[\mathcal{F}, \ell(m-d+1), d]$ FDMRD codes, $\ell \geq m$, with a full $m \times \ell$ diagram $\mathcal{F}$, which attain the bound of Theorem 4 [22], [23].

It was proved in [3] that for general diagrams the bound of Theorem 4 is attained for $d = 1, 2$:

Theorem 5. *For any Ferrers diagram $\mathcal{F}$ there exists an $[\mathcal{F}, \rho, d]$ FDMRD code for $d = 1$ or $d = 2$.*

Some special cases, when this bound is attained for $d > 2$, can also be found in [3].

For a codeword $A \in \mathcal{C}_\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{k\times(n-k)}$ let $A_\mathcal{F}$ denote the part of A related to the entries of $\mathcal{F}$ in A.

Definition 6. Given an FDMRD code $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{F}$, a *lifted FDMRD code* $\mathbb{C}_\mathcal{F}$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathbb{C}_\mathcal{F} = \{X \in \mathcal{G}_q(k, n) : \mathcal{F}(X) = A_\mathcal{F},\ A \in \mathcal{C}_\mathcal{F}\}.$$

This definition is the generalization of the definition of a lifted MRD code [17]. Note, that all the codewords of a lifted MRD code have the same identifying vector of the type $(\underbrace{11...1}_{k}\underbrace{000...00}_{n-k})$. The following theorem [3] is the generalization of the result given in [17].

Theorem 7. *If $\mathcal{C}_\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^{k\times(n-k)}$ is an $[\mathcal{F}, \rho, d]$ Ferrers diagram rank-metric code, then its lifted code $\mathbb{C}_\mathcal{F}$ is an $(n, q^\rho, d, k)_q$ constant dimension code.*

The multilevel construction [3] for constant dimension codes is based on Proposition 1 and Theorem 7:

Multilevel Construction. First, a binary constant weight code of length n, weight k, and Hamming distance $2d$ is chosen to be the set of the identifying vectors for $\mathbb{C}$. Then, for each identifying vector a corresponding lifted FDRM code with minimum injection distance d is constructed. The union of these lifted FDRM codes is an $(n, M, d, k)_q$ code.

B. One-Factorization of Complete Graphs and the Pending Dots Construction

In the construction provided in [4], for $k = 3$ and $d = 2$, in the stage of choosing the identifying vectors for a code $\mathbb{C}$, a set of vectors with minimum (Hamming) distance $2d - 2 = 2$ is allowed, by using a method based on pending dots in a Ferrers diagram [14], which will be explained in the following.

The *pending dots* of a Ferrers diagram $\mathcal{F}$ are the leftmost dots in the first row of $\mathcal{F}$ whose removal has no impact on the size of the corresponding Ferrers diagram rank-metric code. The following lemma follows from [14].

Lemma 8. *Let X and Y be two subspaces in $\mathcal{G}_q(k,n)$ with $d_H(v(X),v(Y)) = 2d-2$, such that the leftmost* one *of $v(X)$ is in the same position as the leftmost* one *of $v(Y)$. Let P_X and P_Y be the sets of pending dots of X and Y, respectively. If $P_X \cap P_Y \neq \varnothing$ and the entries in $P_X \cap P_Y$ (of their Ferrers tableaux forms) are assigned with different values in at least one position, then $d_S(X,Y) = 2d_I(X,Y) \geq 2d$.*

Example 9. Let X and Y be subspaces in $\mathcal{G}_q(3,6)$ which are given by the following generator matrices:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \textcircled{0} & 0 & v_1 & v_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & v_3 & v_4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \textcircled{1} & u_1 & 0 & u_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & u_3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $v_i, u_i \in \mathbb{F}_q$, and the pending dots are emphasized by circles. Their identifying vectors are $v(X) = 101001$ and $v(Y) = 100101$. Clearly, $d_H(v(X),v(Y)) = 2$, while $d_S(X,Y) \geq 4$.

The following results from the area of graph theory will be useful in the following code constructions. We denote by K_m the *complete graph* with m nodes. A *matching* of K_m is a set of non-adjacent edges of K_m. A *perfect (resp. nearly perfect) matching* is a matching that covers all (resp. all but one) nodes of K_m. A *one-factorization (OF)* (resp. *near one-factorization (NOF)*) of K_m is a partition of all edges into perfect (resp. nearly perfect) matchings of K_m. If one labels all nodes of K_m with the numbers from $1,\ldots,m$, then one can easily see the $1-1$-correspondence between the edges of the graph and the weight-2 vectors of $\mathbb{F}_2^m$ by assigning the two ones of the vector in the coordinates labelled by the numbers of the two nodes in the graph which are connected by the corresponding edge.

The following lemma, which follows from a one-factorization and near-one-factorization of a complete graph [24], [25], will be used in our constructions.

Lemma 10. *Let D be the set of all binary vectors of length m and weight 2.*

- *If m is even, D can be partitioned into $m-1$ classes, each of $\frac{m}{2}$ vectors with pairwise disjoint positions of* ones*;*
- *If m is odd, D can be partitioned into m classes, each of $\frac{m-1}{2}$ vectors with pairwise disjoint positions of* ones*.*

The following construction for $k=3$ and $d=2$ based on pending dots from [4] will be used as the base step of our recursive construction proposed in the sequel.

Pending Dots Construction. Let $n \geq 8$ and $q^2+q+1 \geq \ell$, where $\ell = n-4$ for odd n and $\ell = n-3$ for even n. In addition to the lifted MRD code (which has the identifying vector $v_0 = (11100\ldots0)$), the final code $\mathbb{C}$ will contain the codewords with identifying vectors of the form $(x||y)$, where the prefix $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^3$ is of weight 1 and the suffix $y \in \mathbb{F}_2^{n-3}$ is of weight 2. By Lemma 10, we partition the set of suffixes into ℓ classes $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_\ell$ and define the following three sets:

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \{(001||y) : y \in P_1\},$$

$$\mathcal{A}_2 = \{(010||y) : y \in P_i, 2 \leq i \leq \min\{q+1, \ell\}\},$$

$$\mathcal{A}_3 = \begin{cases} \{(100||y) : y \in P_i,\ q+2 \leq i \leq \ell\} & \text{if } \ell > q+1 \\ \varnothing & \text{if } \ell \leq q+1 \end{cases}.$$

Elements with the same prefix and distinct suffixes from the same class P_i have Hamming distance 4. When we use the same prefix for two different classes P_i, P_j, we assign different values in the pending dots of the Ferrers tableaux forms. Then the corresponding lifted FDMRD codes of injection distance 2 are constructed, and their union with the lifted MRD code forms the final code $\mathbb{C}$ of size $q^{2(n-3)} + \begin{bmatrix} n-3 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q$.

In the following sections we will generalize this construction in various ways and obtain codes for any $k \geq 4$ with minimum injection distance $d=2$ or with $d=k-1$, or equivalently minimum subspace distance $2d=4$ or with $2d=2(k-1)$.

III. Construction for $(n, M, k-1, k)_q$ Codes

In this section we provide a recursive construction for $(n, M, k-1, k)_q$ codes, which uses the Pending Dots construction described in Section II as an initial step. Codes obtained by this construction contain a lifted MRD code. The upper bound on the cardinality of such codes is derived in [4] and given in the following theorem.

Theorem 11 ([4]). *If an $(n, M, k-1, k)_q$ code $\mathbb{C}$, $k \geq 3$, contains an $(n, q^{2(n-k)}, k-1, k)_q$ lifted MRD code then*

$$M \leq q^{2(n-k)} + A_q(n-k, k-2, k-1).$$

Note that for $k = 3$ this bound is given by

$$M \leq q^{2(n-3)} + \begin{bmatrix} n-3 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q,$$

which is attained by the Pending Dots construction. Our recursive construction provides a new lower bound on the cardinality of such codes for general k.

To present the construction we first need to extend the definition of pending dots of [14] to a two-dimensional setting, which we will do in the following subsection.

A. Pending Blocks

Definition 12. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a Ferrers diagram with m dots in the rightmost column and ℓ dots in the top row. We say that the $\ell_1 < \ell$ leftmost columns of $\mathcal{F}$ form a *pending block* (of length ℓ_1) if the upper bound on the size of FDMRD code $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}$ from Theorem 4 is equal to the upper bound on the size of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}}$ without the ℓ_1 leftmost columns.

Example 13. Consider the following Ferrers diagrams:

$\mathcal{F}_1 =$  , $\mathcal{F}_2 =$  .

For $d = 3$ by Theorem 4 both codes $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_1}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_2}$ have $|\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}_i}| \leq q^3$, $i = 1, 2$. The diagram $\mathcal{F}_1$ has the pending block and the diagram $\mathcal{F}_2$ has no pending block.

Definition 14. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a Ferrers diagram with m dots in the rightmost column and ℓ dots in the top row, and let $\ell_1 < \ell$, and $m_1 < m$. If the (m_1+1)st row of $\mathcal{F}$ has less dots than the m_1th row of $\mathcal{F}$ and at most $m - \ell_1$ dots, then the ℓ_1 leftmost columns of $\mathcal{F}$ are called a *quasi-pending block* (of size $m_1 \times \ell_1$).

Note that a pending block is also a quasi-pending block. We can now generalize Lemma 8 from pending dots to pending blocks.

Theorem 15. *Let $X, Y \in \mathcal{G}_q(k, n)$, such that* RE(X) *and* RE(Y) *have a quasi-pending block of size $m_1 \times \ell_1$ in the same position and $d_H(v(X), v(Y)) = 2d$. Denote the submatrices of $\mathcal{F}(X)$ and $\mathcal{F}(Y)$ corresponding to the quasi-pending blocks by B_X and B_Y, respectively. Then $d_I(X, Y) \geq d + \mathrm{rank}(B_X - B_Y)$ or equivalently $d_S(X, Y) \geq 2d + 2\mathrm{rank}(B_X - B_Y)$.*

Proof: Since the quasi-pending blocks are in the same position, the first h pivots of RE(X) and RE(Y) are in the same columns. To compute the rank of $\begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{RE}(X) \\ \mathrm{RE}(Y) \end{bmatrix}$ we permute the columns such that the h first pivot columns are to the very left, then the columns of the pending block, then the other pivot columns and then the rest:

$$\mathrm{rank} \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{RE}(X) \\ \mathrm{RE}(Y) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \operatorname{rank} \left[\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} 1 & \dots & 0 & & & & & & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & & \ddots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & B_X & & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & \dots \\ \vdots & & & & & & & & \vdots & \\ \hline 1 & \dots & 0 & & & & & & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & & \ddots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & B_Y & & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & \dots \\ \vdots & & & & & & & & \vdots & \end{array}\right].$$

Now we subtract the lower half of the obtained matrix from the upper half and write the result in the lower half of the new matrix to get

$$= \operatorname{rank} \left[\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} 1 & \dots & 0 & & & & & & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & & \ddots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & B_X & & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & \dots \\ \vdots & & & & & & & & \vdots & \\ \hline 0 & \dots & 0 & & & & & & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & & & \ddots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & B_X - B_Y & & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & & & & & & & & \vdots & \end{array}\right].$$

The additional pivots of $\mathrm{RE}(X)$ and $\mathrm{RE}(Y)$ (to the right in the above representation) that were in different columns in the beginning are still in different columns, hence it follows that $\operatorname{rank} \left[\begin{array}{c} \mathrm{RE(X)} \\ \mathrm{RE(Y)} \end{array}\right] \geq k + \operatorname{rank}(B_X - B_Y) + d$, which implies the statement. ∎

This theorem implies that for the construction of an $(n, M, d, k)_q$ code, by filling the (quasi-) pending blocks with a suitable Ferrers diagram rank metric code, one can choose a set of identifying vectors with lower minimum Hamming distance than $2d$.

B. The Construction.

The following two lemmas will be useful for our construction.

Lemma 16. *Let $n-k-2 \geq n_1 \geq k-2$ and v be an identifying vector of length n and weight k, such that there are $k-2$ many ones in the first n_1 positions of v. Then the Ferrers diagram arising from v has more or equally many dots in any of the first $k-2$ rows than in the last column, and the upper bound for the dimension of a Ferrers diagram code with minimum rank distance $k-1$ is the number of dots in the lower two rows.*

Proof: Naturally, the last column of the Ferrers diagram has at most k many dots. It holds that any column has at most as many dots as the last one. Since there are $k-2$ many ones in the first n_1 positions of v, it follows that there are $n-n_1-2$ zeros in the last $n-n_1$ positions of v. Thus, there are at least $n-n_1-2$ many dots in any but the lower two rows of the Ferrers diagram arising from v. Therefore, if $n-n_1-2 \geq k \iff n-k-2 \geq n_1$ the Ferrers diagram arising from v has more than or equally many dots in any of the first $k-2$ rows than in the last column, and hence than in any column.

From Theorem 4 we know that the bound on the dimension of the FDRM code is given by the minimum number of dots not contained in the first i rows and last $k-2-i$ columns for $i = 0, \dots, k-2$. If we start with $i = k-2$ we get that the dimension of the code is at most the number of dots in the last two rows of the diagram. Inductively, if we decrease i by one, we add a row (of the first $k-2$ rows) and erase a column of the previous diagram, which results in more points, hence the minimum is attained for $i = k-2$. ∎

Remark 17. If an $m \times \ell$-Ferrers diagram has $d-1$ rows with ℓ dots each, then the construction of [3] provides respective FDMRD codes of minimum distance d attaining the bound of Theorem 4.

We need yet another special case of Ferrers diagrams where we can attain the upper bound on the dimension of the code size.

Lemma 18. *For an $m \times \ell$-Ferrers diagram where the jth row has at least x more dots than the $(j+1)$th row for $1 \leq j \leq m-1$ and the lowest row has x many dots, there is a FDMRD code with minimum rank distance m and cardinality q^x.*

Proof: The construction is as follows: For each codeword take a different $w \in \mathbb{F}_q^x$ and fill the first x dots of every row with this vector, whereas all other dots are filled with zeros. The minimum distance follows easily from the fact that the positions of the w's in each row have no column-wise intersection. Since they are all different, any difference of two codewords has a non-zero entry in each row and it is already row-reduced.

The cardinality is clear, hence it remains to show that this attains the bound of Theorem 4. Plugging in $i = k-1$ in Theorem 4 we get that the dimension of the code is less than or equal to the number of dots in the last row, which is achieved by this construction. ∎

We now have all the machinery to describe the new construction for $(n, M, k-1, k)_q$ codes.

Construction A.

Let $k \geq 4$, $s := \sum_{i=3}^{k} i = \frac{k^2+k-6}{2}$, $n \geq s+2+k = \frac{k^2+3k-2}{2}$ and $q^2+q+1 \geq \ell$, where $\ell := n-s = n - \frac{k^2+k-6}{2}$ for odd $n-s$ (or $\ell := n-s-1 = n - \frac{k^2+k-4}{2}$ for even $n-s$).

Identifying vectors: In addition to the identifying vector $v_{00}^k = (11\ldots1100\ldots0)$ of the lifted MRD code $\mathbb{C}_*^k$ (of size $q^{2(n-k)}$ and minimum subspace distance $2(k-1)$), the other identifying vectors of the codewords are defined as follows. First, by Lemma 10, we partition the weight-2 vectors of $\mathbb{F}_2^{n-s}$ into classes $P_1, \ldots, P_\ell$ of size $\frac{\bar{\ell}}{2}$ (where $\ell = \bar{\ell} - 1 = n-s-1$ if $n-s$ even and $\ell = \bar{\ell}+1 = n-s$ if $n-s$ odd) with pairwise disjoint positions of the ones. We define the sets of identifying vectors by a recursion. Let $v_0 \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n-s+3}$ and $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{A}_3 \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^{n-s+3}$, as defined in the Pending Dots construction (see Section II-B). Then $v_{00}^3 = v_0$,

$$\mathcal{A}_0^3 = \emptyset,\ \mathcal{A}_i^3 = \mathcal{A}_i,\ 1 \leq i \leq 3.$$

For $k \geq 4$ we define:

$$\mathcal{A}_0^k = \{v_{01}^k, \ldots, v_{0k-3}^k\},$$

where $v_{0j}^k = (000\ w_j^k\ ||v_{0j-1}^{k-1})$ $(1 \leq j \leq k-3)$, such that the w_j^k are all different weight-1 vectors of $\mathbb{F}_2^{k-3}$. Furthermore we define:

$$\mathcal{A}_1^k = \{(0010\ldots00||z) : z \in \mathcal{A}_1^{k-1}\},$$
$$\mathcal{A}_2^k = \{(0100\ldots00||z) : z \in \mathcal{A}_2^{k-1}\},$$
$$\mathcal{A}_3^k = \{(1000\ldots00||z) : z \in \mathcal{A}_3^{k-1}\},$$

such that the prefixes of the vectors in $\bigcup_{i=0}^{3} \mathcal{A}_i^k$ are vectors of $\mathbb{F}_2^k$ of weight 1. Note, that the suffix $y \in \mathbb{F}_q^{n-s}$ (from the Pending Dots construction) in all the vectors from $\mathcal{A}_1^k$ belongs to P_1, the suffix y in all the vectors from $\mathcal{A}_2^k$ belongs to $\bigcup_{i=2}^{\min\{q+1,\ell\}} P_i$, and the suffix y in all the vectors from $\mathcal{A}_3^k$ belongs to $\bigcup_{i=q+2}^{\ell} P_i$ (the set $\mathcal{A}_3^k$ is empty if $\ell \leq q+1$).

Pending blocks:

- All Ferrers diagrams that correspond to the vectors in $\mathcal{A}_1^k$ have a common pending block with $k-3$ rows and $\sum_{i=3}^{k-j} i$ dots in the jth row, for $1 \leq j \leq k-3$. We fill each of these pending blocks with a different element of a suitable FDMRD code with minimum rank distance $k-3$ and size q^3, according to Lemma 18. Note, that the initial conditions always imply that $q^3 \geq \bar{\ell}$.
- All Ferrers diagrams that correspond to the vectors in $\mathcal{A}_2^k$ have a common pending block with $k-2$ rows and $\sum_{i=3}^{k-j} i+1$ dots in the jth row, $1 \leq j \leq k-2$. Every vector which has a suffix y from the same P_i will have the same value $a_i \in \mathbb{F}_q$ in the first entry in each row of the common pending block, such that the vectors with suffixes from the different classes will have different values in these entries. (This corresponds to a FDMRD code of distance $k-2$ and size q.) Given the filling of the first entries of every row, all the other entries of the pending blocks are filled by a FDMRD code with minimum distance $k-3$, according to Lemma 18.
- All Ferrers diagrams that correspond to the vectors in $\mathcal{A}_3^k$ have a common pending block with $k-2$ rows and $\sum_{i=3}^{k-j} i+2$ dots in the jth row, $1 \leq j \leq k-2$. The filling of these pending blocks is analogous to the

previous case, but for the suffixes from the different P_i-classes we fix the first two entries in each row of a pending block.

Ferrers tableaux forms: On the dots corresponding to the last $n-s-2$ columns of the Ferrers diagrams for each vector v_j in a given $\mathcal{A}_i^k$, $0 \leq i \leq 3$, we construct a FDMRD code with minimum distance $k-1$ (according to Remark 17) and lift it to obtain $\mathbb{C}_{i,j}^k$. We define $\mathbb{C}_i^k = \bigcup_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{A}_i^k|} \mathbb{C}_{i,j}^k$.

Code: The final code is defined as

$$\mathbb{C}^k = \bigcup_{i=0}^{3} \mathbb{C}_i^k \cup \mathbb{C}_*^k.$$

Theorem 19. *The code $\mathbb{C}^k$ obtained by Construction A has minimum injection distance $k-1$ and cardinality* $|\mathbb{C}^k| = q^{2(n-k)} + q^{2(n-(k+(k-1)))} + \ldots + q^{2(n-\frac{k^2+k-6}{2})} + \begin{bmatrix} n-\frac{k^2+k-6}{2} \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q$.

Proof: We will first prove the cardinality by induction on k. Observe that the only identifying vector that contributes additional codewords in $\mathbb{C}^k$ compared to $\mathbb{C}^{k-1}$ is v_{00}^k, since for all the other identifying vectors, the additional line of dots of the corresponding Ferrers diagrams does not increase the cardinality due to Lemma 16, and thus $|\mathbb{C}^k| = |\mathbb{C}^{k-1}| + q^{2(n-k)}$ for any $k \geq 4$. Solving this recursively results in the above formula.

Next we prove that the minimum injection distance of $\mathbb{C}^k$ is $k-1$. Let $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^k$, $X \neq Y$. If $v(X) = v(Y)$, then by Proposition 3, $d_S(X,Y) \geq 2(k-1)$, i.e. $d_I(X,Y) \geq k-1$. Now we assume that $v(X) \neq v(Y)$. Note, that according to the definition of identifying vectors, $d_I(X,Y) \geq d_H(v(X,v(Y))/2 = k-1$ for $(X,Y) \in \mathbb{C}_*^k \times \mathbb{C}_i^k$, $0 \leq i \leq 3$, for $(X,Y) \in \mathbb{C}_0^k \times \mathbb{C}_0^k$, and for $(X,Y) \in \mathbb{C}_i^k \times \mathbb{C}_j^k$, $i \neq j$. Now let $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}_i^k$, for some $1 \leq i \leq 3$.

- If the suffixes of X and Y of length $n-3$ belong to the same class P_t, then $d_H(v(X), v(Y)) = 4$ and $d_R(B_X, B_Y) = k-3$, for the submatrices B_X, B_Y of $\mathcal{F}(X), \mathcal{F}(Y)$ corresponding to the common pending blocks. Then by Theorem 15, $d_I(X,Y) \geq 2 + (k-3) = k-1$.
- If the suffixes of X and Y of length $n-3$ belong to different classes P_{t_1}, P_{t_2}, then $d_H(v(X), v(Y)) = 2$ and $d_R(B_X, B_Y) = k-2$, for the submatrices B_X, B_Y of $\mathcal{F}(X), \mathcal{F}(Y)$ corresponding to the common pending blocks. Then by Theorem 15, $d_I(X,Y) \geq 1 + (k-2) = k-1$.

Hence, for any $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}^k$ it holds that $d_I(X,Y) \geq k-1$. ∎

Corollary 20. *Let $n \geq \frac{k^2+3k-2}{2}$ and $q^2+q+1 \geq \ell$, where $\ell = n - \frac{k^2+k-6}{2}$ for odd $n - \frac{k^2+k-6}{2}$ (or $\ell = n - \frac{k^2+k-4}{2}$ for even $n - \frac{k^2+k-6}{2}$). Then*

$$A_q(n, k-1, k) \geq$$

$$q^{2(n-k)} + \sum_{j=3}^{k-1} q^{2(n-\sum_{i=j}^{k} i)} + \begin{bmatrix} n-\frac{k^2+k-6}{2} \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q.$$

Example 21. Let $k=5$, $d=4$, $n=19$, and $q=2$. The code $\mathbb{C}^5$ obtained by Construction A has cardinality $2^{28} + 2^{20} + 2^{14} + \begin{bmatrix} 7 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q = 2^{28} + 1067627$ (the largest previously known code is of cardinality $2^{28} + 1052778$ [3]). We now illustrate the construction:

First, we partition the set of suffixes $y \in \mathbb{F}_2^7$ of weight 2 into 7 classes, $P_1, \ldots, P_7$ of size 3 each. The identifying vectors of the code are partitioned as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{00}^5 &= (11111||0000||000||0000000) \\
\mathcal{A}_0^5 &= \{(00001||1111||000||0000000), (00010||0001||111||0000000)\} \\
\mathcal{A}_1^5 &= \{(00100||0010||001||y) : y \in P_1\} \\
\mathcal{A}_2^5 &= \{(01000||0100||010||y) : y \in \{P_2, P_3\}\} \\
\mathcal{A}_3^5 &= \{(10000||1000||100||y) : y \in \{P_4, P_5, P_6, P_7\}\}
\end{aligned}$$

To demonstrate the idea of the construction we will consider only the set $\mathcal{A}_2^5$. All the codewords corresponding to $\mathcal{A}_2^5$ have the following common pending block B:

If the suffix $y \in P_2$, or $y \in P_3$ then to distinguish between these two classes we assign the following values to B, respectively:



For the identifying vectors with the suffixes y from P_i, $i = 2, 3$, we construct a FDMRD code of distance 2 for the remaining dots of B (here, $a = 0$ or $a = 1$), as follows:



Since P_i contains only three elements, we only need to use three of the above tableaux. We proceed analogously for the pending blocks of $\mathcal{A}_1^5, \mathcal{A}_3^5$. Then we fill the Ferrers diagrams corresponding to the last 7 columns of the identifying vectors with an FDMRD code of minimum rank distance 4 and lift these elements. Moreover, we add the lifted MRD code corresponding to v_{00}^5, which has cardinality 2^{28}. The number of codewords which corresponds to the set $\mathcal{A}_0^5$ is $2^{20} + 2^{14}$. The number of codewords that correspond to $\mathcal{A}_1^5 \cup \mathcal{A}_2^5 \cup \mathcal{A}_3^5$ is $\begin{bmatrix} 7 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q$.

For small alphabets, when $q^2 + q + 1 < \ell$, we use as the initial step for the recursion the Modified Pending Dots construction (Construction II in [4]), where the last $n - 3$ coordinates of the identifying vectors are partitioned into sets of size $q^2 + q + 2$ and then the same idea for the construction of the identifying vectors is applied in each such set. This Modified Pending Dots construction generates an $(n, M, 2, 3)_q$ constant dimension code with $M = q^{2(n-3)} + \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} \begin{bmatrix} q^2+q+2 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q q^{2(n-3-(q^2+q+2)i)}$, which contains the lifted MRD code, where $\alpha = \left\lfloor \frac{n-3}{q^2+q+2} \right\rfloor$. Then the size of an $(n, M, k-1, k)_q$ constant dimension code $\mathbb{C}^k$ obtained from the modified recursive construction is given by

$$|\mathbb{C}^k| = q^{2(n-k)} + \sum_{j=3}^{k-1} q^{2(n-\sum_{i=j}^{k} i)} + \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha_k} \begin{bmatrix} q^2+q+2 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q q^{2(n-\frac{k^2+k-6}{2}-(q^2+q+1)i)},$$

where $\alpha_k = \left\lfloor \frac{n-\frac{k^2+k-6}{2}}{q^2+q+2} \right\rfloor$. Then, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 22. *Let $n \geq \frac{k^2+3k-2}{2}$ and $q^2+q+1 < \ell$, where $\ell = n - \frac{k^2+k-6}{2}$ for odd $n - \frac{k^2+k-6}{2}$ (or $\ell = n - \frac{k^2+k-4}{2}$ for even $n - \frac{k^2+k-6}{2}$). Then*

$$A_q(n, k-1, k) \geq q^{2(n-k)} + \sum_{j=3}^{k-1} q^{2(n-\sum_{i=j}^{k} i)} + \sum_{i=1}^{\alpha_k} \begin{bmatrix} q^2+q+2 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q q^{2(n-\frac{k^2+k-6}{2}-(q^2+q+1)i)},$$

where $\alpha_k = \left\lfloor \frac{n-\frac{k^2+k-6}{2}}{q^2+q+2} \right\rfloor$.

In the following, we compare the size of the codes obtained from Construction A (and its modification for small alphabets) to the bound in Theorem 11. In particular, we are interested in an estimation of the function $F(n,k,q)$ defined by $F(n,k,q) := \frac{\mathbb{C}^k - q^{2(n-k)}}{A_q(n-k,k-2,k-1)}$. The following bound on $A_q(n,d,k)$ was established in [5], [26], [27]:

$$A_q(n,d,k) \leq \frac{\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k-d+1 \end{bmatrix}_q}{\begin{bmatrix} k \\ k-d+1 \end{bmatrix}_q}.$$

Then

$$F(n,k,q) \;\; = \frac{\mathbb{C}^k - q^{2(n-k)}}{A_q(n-k,k-2,k-1)} \geq \frac{\mathbb{C}^k - q^{2(n-k)}}{\begin{bmatrix} n-k \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q / \begin{bmatrix} k-1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q}. \tag{4}$$

One can show that $F(n,k,q)$ is an increasing function in k and q and that for $k \geq 10$, $n \geq \frac{k^2+3k-2}{2}$, it holds that $F(n,k,2) \geq 0.99$. Hence, Construction A asymptotically attains the bound of Theorem 11 for any k and q. In fact it gets very close to the bound already for small values of k and q. In comparison, the lifted MRD construction attains the bound asymptotically as well, but is much further away from the bound for small parameters.

The comparison between the cardinality of codes obtained by Construction A and other known codes is given in Section VI, Table I.

IV. Constructions for $(n, M, 2, k)_q$ Codes

In this section we present two constructions for $(n, M, 2, k)_q$ codes with $k \geq 4$ and $n \geq 2k+2$. These constructions will then give rise to new lower bounds on the size of constant dimension codes with minimum injection distance 2 (or equivalently subspace distance 4). The first one (Construction B), which is a modification of the multilevel construction from [3], is based on a specific choice of a set of identifying vectors obtained from matchings and the complement of matchings of the corresponding complete graphs and is given for general $k \geq 4$. The second one (Construction C) combines the results on pending blocks and Ferrers diagrams arising from different (nearly) perfect matchings of the complete graph. Since it improves the first construction only for the parameters $k = 4$ and $k = 5$, it will only be explained for these two cases.

A. A Special Instance of the Multilevel Construction

The multilevel construction (see Section II) is a general code construction which usually provides large codes. However, it does not give rise to a general formula for the cardinality of the arising codes, since this construction depends on the specific choice of a related constant weight code. In the following, we will use a specific (nearly) perfect matching and the complement of a matching of complete graphs of sizes $n-k$ and k, respectively, to produce a good choice of the constant weight code for the multilevel construction and to get a closed formula for the constant dimension code cardinality.

We first need the following result, which is similar to Lemma 16.

Lemma 23. *Let $n \geq 2k+2$. Let v be an identifying vector of length n and weight k, such that there are $k-2$ many ones in the first k positions of v. Then the Ferrers diagram arising from v has more or equally many dots in the first row than in the last column, and the upper bound for the dimension of a Ferrers diagram code with minimum distance 2 is the number of dots that are not in the first row.*

Proof: Analogous to the proof of Lemma 16. ∎

From Theorems 4 and 5 the next statement follows.

Corollary 24. *The dimension of a Ferrers diagram code with minimum distance 2 in the setting of Lemma 23 is the number of dots that are not in the first row.*

Let $n \geq 2k+2$ and define the subset of $\mathbb{F}_2^{n-k}$

$$O_{n-k} := \{(110\ldots0), (00110\ldots0), (0000110\ldots0), \ldots\},$$

which has $\lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor$ elements (the two ones are always shifted to the right by two positions). In other words, if we denote by $v_i(j)$ the jth coordinate of the vector v_i, the set O_{n-k} contains binary vectors v_i of length $n-k$ and weight 2, such that $v_i(j) = 1$ if and only if $\lceil \frac{j}{2} \rceil = i$. Note, that for odd $n-k$ the last entry of all vectors in O_{n-k} is always zero.

Also, we define the subset of $\mathbb{F}_2^k$

$$\bar{O}_k := \{(11\ldots100), (11\ldots10011), (11\ldots1001111), \ldots\},$$

which has $\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$ elements (the two zeros are always shifted to the left by two positions). In other words, the set $\bar{O}_k$ contains binary vectors u_i of length k and weight $k-2$, such that $u_i(j) = 0$ if and only if $\lceil \frac{k-j+1}{2} \rceil = i$. Note, that for odd k the first entry of all vectors in $\bar{O}_k$ is always one.

Remark 25. The elements of O_{n-k} and $\bar{O}_k$ form a (nearly) perfect matching of K_{n-k} and the complement of a (nearly) perfect matching of K_k, respectively.

Construction B.

Let $n \geq 2k+2$. We use the following sets of identifying vectors for the multilevel construction:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_0^k &= \{(11\ldots11111||0\ldots0)\} \\
\mathcal{A}_1^k &= \{(11\ldots11100||v) \mid v \in O_{n-k}\} \\
\mathcal{A}_2^k &= \{(11\ldots10011||v) \mid v \in O_{n-k}\} \\
&\vdots \\
\mathcal{A}_{\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor}^k &= \left\{(w||v) \mid v \in O_{n-k}, w = \begin{cases} (0011\ldots1) & \text{if } k \text{ even} \\ (10011\ldots1) & \text{if } k \text{ odd} \end{cases}\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where the prefixes are the different elements from $\bar{O}_k$ (except for $\mathcal{A}_0^k$). Then we construct the corresponding lifted FDMRD codes with injection distance 2. Note that the code corresponding to $\mathcal{A}_0^k$ is the conventional lifted MRD code. Furthermore we add the largest known $(n-k, M, 2, k)_q$ code, with k zero columns appended in front of every codeword.

Theorem 26. *The code from Construction B has minimum injection distance* 2 *and cardinality*

$$q^{(k-1)(n-k)} + A_q^*(n-k, 2, k) + \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{k-3}{2} \rfloor} q^{(k-3)(n-k)-4i} + \epsilon(k-1) q^{(k-3)(n-k-2)} \right) \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor - 1} q^{2(2i+\epsilon(n-k))},$$

where $\epsilon(i) = 1$ *if* i *odd and* $\epsilon(i) = 0$ *if* i *even.*

Proof: The minimum distance for elements with different identifying vectors follows by Proposition 1 from the Hamming distance of the identifying vectors, which is always at least 4. For elements with the same identifying vector it follows from the minimum rank distance of the FDMRD code, by Proposition 3.

The cardinality can be shown as follows. From Theorem 5, Lemma 23 and Corollary 24 we know that the number of dots not in the first row of the FD is the dimension of the FDMRD code. Hence, the subcode arising from $\mathcal{A}_0^k$ has dimension $(k-1)(n-k)$. The number of matrix fillings for the height-2 Ferrers diagrams corresponding to O_{n-k} is equal to $\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor - 1} q^{2(2i+\epsilon(n-k))}$ (where the empty matrix is also counted). The number of fillings for the Ferrers diagrams corresponding to $\bar{O}_k$ without the first rows is equal to $\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{k-3}{2} \rfloor} q^{(k-3)(n-k)-4i} + \epsilon(k-1) q^{(k-3)(n-k-2)}$. Hence the formula follows. ∎

Corollary 27. *Let $n \geq 2k+2$. Then*

$$A_q(n,2,k) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n-2}{k} \rfloor - 1} \left(q^{(k-1)(n-ik)} + \frac{(q^{2(k-2)}-1)(q^{2(n-ik-1)}-1)}{(q^4-1)^2} q^{(k-3)(n-ik-2)+4} \right).$$

Proof: From Theorem 26 it follows that the value for $A_q(n,2,k) - A_q^*(n-k,2,k) - q^{(k-1)(n-k)}$ is lower bounded by

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{k-3}{2} \rfloor} q^{(k-3)(n-k)-4i} \right) \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n-k-2}{2} \rfloor} q^{4i+2\epsilon(n-k)} \right) = q^{(k-3)(n-k)+2\epsilon(n-k)} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{k-3}{2} \rfloor} q^{-4i} \right) \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n-k-2}{2} \rfloor} q^{4i} \right).$$

Solving the sums and then using the equality $4\lfloor \frac{x}{2} \rfloor = 2x - 2\epsilon(x)$ we get that this expression is equal to

$$q^{(k-3)(n-k)+2\epsilon(n-k)} \frac{q^{-4\lfloor \frac{k-3}{2} \rfloor}(q^{4(\lfloor \frac{k-3}{2} \rfloor + 1)} - 1)(q^{4\lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor} - 1)}{(q^4-1)^2}$$

$$= q^{(k-3)(n-k)+2(\epsilon(n-k)+\epsilon(k-1))} \frac{(q^{2(k-1-\epsilon(k-1))}-1)(q^{2(n-k-\epsilon(n-k))}-1)}{(q^4-1)^2}$$

This expression takes its minimum for $\epsilon(n-k) = \epsilon(k-1) = 1$, hence

$$A_q(n,2,k) \geq A_q^*(n-k,2,k) + q^{(k-1)(n-k)} + q^{(k-3)(n-k-2)+4} \frac{(q^{2(k-2)}-1)(q^{2(n-k-1)}-1)}{(q^4-1)^2}.$$

Applying this bound recursively yields the desired formula. ∎

Remark 28. Here we derived a closed cardinality formula for the special instance of the multilevel construction for $d = 2$. Note that one can also apply this idea to obtain a bound on the cardinality for constant dimension codes with other values for the minimum injection distance.

B. New $(n, M, 2, 4)_q$- and $(n, M, 2, 5)_q$ Codes from One-Factorizations and Pending Dots

The construction presented in this subsection is based on a one-factorization of a complete graph which is used to construct a set of identifying vectors for the proposed codes, by generalizing the Pending Dots construction to $k > 3$. However, in contrast to the Pending Dots construction, here we use not all but specifically chosen perfect matchings which result in a large constant dimension code. First, we consider one-factorizations and the Ferrers diagrams arising from them.

1) Ferrers Diagrams from One-Factorizations of the Complete Graph: We will now present some results on Ferrers diagrams arising from the weight-2 vector representation of matchings of the complete graph K_n. To do so we will use some graph theoretic results (see e.g. [24], [25]) that will be useful for our choice of identifying vectors later on. We start by with the existence proof of (near) one-factorizations, (see also Lemma 10 in Section II), since we need the idea of this proof for our following results.

Theorem 29 ([24], [25])**.**

1) *If n is odd there always exists a near one-factorization (NOF) of K_n.*
2) *If n is even there always exists a one-factorization (OF) of K_n.*

Proof:

1) If n is odd we can draw the nodes of K_n as a circle. Then we can choose one edge and all its parallels, which will give us a nearly perfect matching of K_n. We can repeat this step for any edge that is not covered yet and get a NOF of K_n.
2) If n is even we can use $n-1$ nodes of K_n as a circle, just like before, and use the remaining node as the center of the circle. Then we use again the set of parallel edges plus the edge that connects the remaining node on the circle with the center of the circle, which is a perfect matching. The set of all these different perfect matchings is an OF of K_n.

∎

Then one can easily count the number of elements in the sets of a NOF or an OF of K_n (see also Lemma 10):

Lemma 30.

1) *For a given odd n the NOF of K_n has n many nearly perfect matchings and each one of them contains $\frac{n-1}{2}$ elements.*
2) *For a given even n the OF of K_n has $n-1$ many perfect matchings and each one of them contains $\frac{n}{2}$ elements.*

As in Section II, we denote the different (nearly) perfect matchings of a (near) one-factorization in the vector representation by P_i and call them *classes*.

In the following construction we want to use the matchings which contribute the largest possible FDRM codes. So we need the following lemma, which gives the sizes of the corresponding Ferrers diagrams and, as a consequence, the cardinality of the FDRM codes. We use the construction of matchings described in the proof of Theorem 29. We denote $n' := n-k$ and label all the outside nodes counter-clock-wise from 1 to $n'-1$ if n' is even, and from 1 to n' if n' is odd. If n' is even, the center node is labeled by n' and we name P_i the perfect matching that contains the edge (n', i) as the center edge (i.e. all other edges are orthogonal to this one). If n' is odd, there is no center node and we name P_i the nearly perfect matching that corresponds to the matching that does not cover node i.

Lemma 31. *For a given P_i, the size of the respective FDRM code with rank distance 1 (i.e. the number of different matrix fillings for the corresponding Ferrers diagrams) is given by*

- $\left(\frac{n'}{2}-i\right)q^{(n'-2i)} + (i-1)q^{(2(n'-i)-1)} + q^{(n'-i-1)}$ *if $i \leq \frac{n'}{2}$ and n' is even,*
- $\left(i-\frac{n'}{2}\right)q^{(3n'-2(i+1))} + (n'-i-1)q^{(2(n'-i)-1)} + q^{(n'-i-1)}$ *if $i > \frac{n'}{2}$ and n' is even,*
- $\left(\frac{n'+1}{2}-i\right)q^{(n'-2i-1)} + (i-1)q^{(2(n'-i)-1)}$ *if $i \leq \frac{n'+1}{2}$ and n' is odd,*
- $\left(i-\frac{n'+1}{2}\right)q^{(3n'-2i-1)} + (n'-i)q^{(2(n'-i)-1)}$ *if $i > \frac{n'+1}{2}$ and n' is odd.*

Proof: Can be found in Appendix A. ∎

2) Code Construction: We will now describe a construction for constant dimension codes with $k=4$ and $k=5$. The idea in both cases is similar to the multilevel construction: To construct the identifying vectors, we start with $(1\ldots10\ldots0)$ and then construct sets of identifying vectors with prefixes of length k and weight $k-2$, and suffixes of length $n' := n-k$ and weight 2. The suffixes will be chosen from some of the (nearly) one-factors P_i of K_{n-k}. We choose the prefixes and suffixes that contribute the largest FDRM codes, using Lemma 31. In addition, we use pending dots to allow for a choice of identifying vectors with a smaller Hamming distance.

Construction C-4.

Let $n \geq 10$ and $n' = n-4$. Hence, n' is even if and only if n is even. We use the following sets of identifying vectors

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_0^4 &= \{(1111||0\ldots0)\}\\
\mathcal{A}_1^4 &= \{(1100||v), (0011||v) \mid v \in P_{\lceil \frac{n'}{2}\rceil+1}\}\\
\mathcal{A}_2^4 &= \{(1001||v), (0110||v) \mid v \in P_2\}\\
\mathcal{A}_3^4 &= \Big\{(1010||v), (0101||v) \mid v \in \bigcup_{i=2}^{\min\{\lceil \frac{q}{2}\rceil+1, \lfloor \frac{n'}{2}\rfloor\}} P_{\lceil \frac{n'}{2}\rceil+i} \cup \bigcup_{i=3}^{\min\{\lfloor \frac{q}{2}\rfloor+2, \lceil \frac{n'}{2}\rceil\}} P_i\Big\}
\end{aligned}$$

and construct the corresponding lifted FDMRD codes with injection distance 2, where we use the pending dot in $\mathcal{A}_3^4$. Note that the code corresponding to $\mathcal{A}_0^4$ is the conventional lifted MRD code. Furthermore, we add the largest known $(n-4, M, 2, 4)_q$ code, with 4 zero columns appended in front of every codeword, to obtain a constant dimension code $\mathbb{C}^4$.

Theorem 32. *The code $\mathbb{C}^4$ obtained by Construction C-4 has minimum subspace distance 4 and cardinality given by*

$$q^{3(n-4)} + (q^{(n-4)} + q^{(n-6)})\left[q^{2(n-6)} + (\frac{n}{2}-4)q^{(n-7)} + q^{(\frac{n}{2}-4)}\right] + (q^{(n-5)} + q^{(n-6)})\times$$

$$\left[\sum_{i=2}^{\min\{\lceil\frac{q}{2}\rceil+1,\lfloor\frac{n'}{2}\rfloor\}}(iq^{2n-2i-10}+(\frac{n-6}{2}-i)q^{n-2i-5}+q^{\frac{n-6}{2}-i})+\right.$$
$$\left.\sum_{i=1}^{\min\{\lfloor\frac{q}{2}\rfloor+1,\lceil\frac{n'}{2}\rceil-1\}}(iq^{2n-2i-11}+(\frac{n-6}{2}-i)q^{n-2i-6}+q^{n-i-6})\right]$$
$$+A_q^*(n-4,2,4)$$

if n is even, and

$$q^{3(n-4)}+(q^{(n-4)}+q^{(n-6)})\left[q^{2(n-6)}+(\frac{n-3}{2})q^{(n-8)}\right]+(q^{(n-5)}+q^{(n-6)})\times$$
$$\left[\sum_{i=2}^{\min\{\lceil\frac{q}{2}\rceil+1,\lfloor\frac{n'}{2}\rfloor\}}(iq^{2n-2i-10}+(\frac{n-5}{2}-i)q^{n-2i-6})\right.$$
$$\left.+\sum_{i=1}^{\min\{\lfloor\frac{q}{2}\rfloor+1,\lceil\frac{n'}{2}\rceil-1\}}(iq^{2n-2i-11}+(\frac{n-5}{2}-i)q^{n-2i-7})\right]$$
$$+A_q^*(n-4,2,4)$$

if n is odd.

Proof: The minimum distance for elements with different identifying vectors follows from the Hamming distance of the identifying vectors, together with the pending dots, i.e, from Proposition 1 and Lemma 8. For elements with the same identifying vector it follows from the minimum rank distance of the FDMRD code, by Proposition 3.

The proof for the cardinality can be found in Appendix B. ■

Example 33. Let $q=2$, $n=10$. Then we have $A_2(10,2,4)\geq 2^{18}+37456+21$, where $A_2(6,2,4)=21$. The largest previously known code obtained by the multilevel construction [3] has cardinality $2^{18}+34768$.

Example 34. Let $q=2$, $n=12$. Then we have $A_2(12,2,4)\geq 2^{24}+2333568+701+2^{12}=2^{24}+2338365$, where $A_2(8,2,4)\geq 701+2^{12}$. The largest previously known code obtained by the multilevel construction [3] has cardinality $2^{24}+2290845$.

Construction C-5.
Let $n\geq 12$ and $n'=n-5$. Hence, n' is even if and only if n is odd. We use the following sets of identifying vectors

$$\mathcal{A}_1^5=\{(11100||v),(10011||v)\mid v\in P_{\lceil\frac{n'}{2}\rceil+1}\}$$
$$\mathcal{A}_2^5=\{(11010||v),(01101||v)\mid v\in P_2\}$$
$$\mathcal{A}_3^5=\{(01110||v),(10101||v)\mid v\in P_{\lceil\frac{n'}{2}\rceil+2}\}$$
$$\mathcal{A}_4^5=\{(00111||v),(11001||v)\mid v\in P_3\}$$
$$\mathcal{A}_5^5=\left\{(10110||v),(01011||v)\mid v\in\bigcup_{i=3}^{\min\{\lceil\frac{q}{2}\rceil+2,\lfloor\frac{n'}{2}\rfloor\}}P_{\lceil\frac{n'}{2}\rceil+i}\cup\bigcup_{i=4}^{\min\{\lfloor\frac{q}{2}\rfloor+3,\lceil\frac{n'}{2}\rceil\}}P_i\right\}$$

and construct the corresponding lifted FDMRD codes with injection distance 2, where we use the pending dot in $\mathcal{A}_5^5$. Note that the code corresponding to $\mathcal{A}_0^5$ is the conventional lifted MRD code. Furthermore, we add the largest known $(n-5,M,2,5)_q$ code, with 5 zero columns appended in front of every codeword to obtain a constant dimension code $\mathbb{C}^5$.

Theorem 35. *The code $\mathbb{C}^5$ obtained by Construction C-5 has minimum subspace distance 4 and cardinality given by*

- $q^{4(n-5)}+(q^{2n-10}+q^{2n-14})(q^{2(n-7)}+(\frac{n-8}{2})q^{(n-9)})+(q^{2n-11}+q^{2n-13})(\frac{n-8}{2}q^{(n-10)}+q^{(2n-15)})+(q^{2n-12}+q^{2n-13})(2q^{2(n-8)}+\frac{n-10}{2}q^{(n-11)})+(q^{2n-12}+q^{2n-14})\left[\sum_{i=3}^{\min\{\lceil\frac{q}{2}\rceil+2,\lfloor\frac{n'}{2}\rfloor\}}(iq^{2n-2i-12}+(\frac{n-6}{2}-i)q^{n-2i-7})+\sum_{i=2}^{\min\{\lfloor\frac{q}{2}\rfloor+2,\lceil\frac{n'}{2}\rceil-1\}}(iq^{2n-2i-13}+(\frac{n-6}{2}-i)q^{n-2i-8})\right]+A_q^*(n-5,2,5)$
  if n is even.

- $q^{4(n-5)}+(q^{2n-10}+q^{2n-14})(q^{2n-14}+(\frac{n-9}{2})q^{(n-8)}+q^{\frac{n-9}{2}})+(q^{2n-11}+q^{2n-13})(\frac{n-9}{2}q^{(n-9)}+q^{(2n-15)}+q^{n-8})+(q^{2n-12}+q^{2n-13})(q^{2n-16}+(\frac{n-11}{2})q^{(n-10)}+q^{\frac{n-11}{2}})+(q^{2n-12}+q^{2n-14})\left[\sum_{i=3}^{\min\{\lceil\frac{q}{2}\rceil+2,\lfloor\frac{n'}{2}\rfloor\}}(iq^{2n-2i-12}+(\frac{n-7}{2}-i)q^{n-2i-6}+q^{\frac{n-7}{2}-i})+\sum_{i=2}^{\min\{\lfloor\frac{q}{2}\rfloor+2,\lceil\frac{n'}{2}\rceil-1\}}(iq^{2n-2i-13}+(\frac{n-7}{2}-i)q^{n-2i-7}+q^{n-i-7})\right]+A_q^*(n-5,2,5)$
  if n is odd.

Proof: The minimum distance for elements with different identifying vectors follows from the Hamming distance of the identifying vectors, together with the pending dots, by Proposition 1 and Lemma 8. For elements with the same identifying vector it follows from the minimum rank distance of the FDMRD code, by Proposition 3.
The proof for the cardinality can be found in Appendix B. ∎

Remark 36. One can easily generalize Constructions C-4 and C-5 to larger values of k by choosing the prefixes for the sets $\mathcal{A}_i^k$ as follows: Choose an OF (or NOF) of K_k, look at its vector representation and add the all-one vector to all these vectors (i.e. bitflip all coordinates). Thus, the prefixes in a given set $\mathcal{A}_i^k$ form a code with constant weight $k-2$ and minimum Hamming distance 4 in $\mathbb{F}_2^k$. But one can then prove that there is no such set with pending dots in all its elements. Hence, this generalization would not improve the multilevel construction from [3]. This is why we only describe the construction for $k=4$ or $k=5$ in this work.

The comparison between the multilevel construction and the codes obtained by Constructions B and C can be found in Section VI, Table II. One can see that Constructions C-4 and C-5 improve Construction B, but remember that Construction B works for general k and thus for more parameters than Construction C-4 or C-5. Furthermore, Construction C-4 yields larger codes than the multilevel construction and hence results the largest known codes for some parameter sets. On the other hand, Construction C-5 does not improve the cardinality of the codes arising from the multilevel construction. The advantage still is that we have a closed formula for all constructions explained in this section, in contrast to the multilevel construction.

V. Construction for a New $(n, M, d, k)_q$ Code from an Old Code

In the following we discuss a way for constructing a new constant dimension code with minimum injection distance d (or subspace distance $2d$) from a given one. This approach is fairly simple, but surprisingly, for some families of parameters it provides the largest known codes.

Construction D.
Let $\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{G}_q(k,n)$ be an $(n, M, d, k)_q$ code, let Δ be an integer such that $\Delta \geq k$, and let $\mathcal{C}$ be an $[\mathcal{F}, \Delta(k-d+1), d]$ FDMRD code with a full $k \times \Delta$ rectangular Ferrers diagram. Define

$$\mathbb{C}' = \{X' \in \mathcal{G}_q(k,n') : \mathrm{RE}(X') = [\mathrm{RE}(X)A], X \in \mathbb{C}, A \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Theorem 37. *The code $\mathbb{C}'$ obtained by Construction D is an $(n' = n+\Delta, M', d, k)_q$ code in $\mathcal{G}_q(k,n')$, such that*

$$M' = Mq^{\Delta(k-d+1)}.$$

Proof: Since $|\mathcal{C}| = q^{\Delta(k-d+1)}$, it follows from Theorem 4 that $M' = Mq^{\Delta(k-d+1)}$. To prove the minimum distance we distinguish between two cases:

1) Let $X', Y' \in \mathbb{C}'$, such that $\mathrm{RE}(X') = [\mathrm{RE}(X)A]$, $\mathrm{RE}(Y') = [\mathrm{RE}(X)B]$, for $X \in \mathbb{C}$ and $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$, $A \neq B$. Then $v(X') = v(Y')$ since all the ones of the identifying vectors of the codewords from $\mathbb{C}'$ appear in the

first k coordinates. Hence, by Proposition 3, $d_I(X',Y') = d_R(\mathrm{RE}(X'),\mathrm{RE}(Y'))$. Since $\mathrm{RE}(X') - \mathrm{RE}(Y') = [0A - B]$, where 0 is a $k \times n$ zeros matrix, we have $d_I(X',Y') = d_R(A,B) \geq d$, since $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$.

2) Let $X', Y' \in \mathbb{C}'$, such that $\mathrm{RE}(X') = [\mathrm{RE}(X)A]$, $\mathrm{RE}(Y') = [\mathrm{RE}(Y)B]$, for $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}$, $X \neq Y$, and $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$. Then $d_I(X',Y') = k - \dim(X' \cap Y') \geq k - \dim(X \cap Y) \geq d$, since $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}$.

■

Example 38. We take the $(8, 2^{12}+701, 2, 4)_2$ code $\mathbb{C}$ constructed in [4] and apply on it Construction D with $\Delta = 4$. Then the new code $\mathbb{C}'$ has cardinality $|\mathbb{C}'| = 2^{24} + 701 \cdot 2^{12} = 2^{24} + 2871296$ and has parameters $(12, |\mathbb{C}'|, 2, 4)_2$. The largest previously known code of these parameters of size $2^{24} + 2290845$ was obtained in [3].

Like in the constructions before we can then also add codes of shorter length with zeros appended in front to these codes. Hence we get a new lower bound as follows.

Corollary 39. *Let $n \geq 3k$. Then for any positive integer Δ, such that $n \geq \Delta \geq k$, it holds that*

$$A_q(n,d,k) \geq q^{\Delta(k-d+1)} A_q(n-\Delta,d,k) + A_q(\Delta,d,k).$$

In particular, for $\Delta = k$, we get

$$A_q(n,d,k) \geq q^{k(k-d+1)} A_q(n-k,d,k) + 1$$

and, for $\Delta = n - k$, we get

$$A_q(n,d,k) \geq q^{(n-k)(k-d+1)} + A_q(n-k,d,k)$$

which, if recursively solved, corresponds exactly to the formula of the multi-component lifted MRD codes from [21].

Remark 40. Note that Construction D is related to the interleaved rank-metric codes (see e.g. [28]). In particular, the code obtained in Construction D can be considered as a lifted Ferrers diagram interleaved code, where to the FDRM code raised from the first n coordinates is appended another FDRM code with the same minimum rank distance and with a full rectangular $k \times \Delta$ Ferrers diagram. Then, this construction can be considered as a generalization of an interleaved construction, since every code can be used as the initial step of construction.

VI. Comparison of Constant Dimension Code Sizes

In this section we compare the cardinalities of our new code constructions to other known constant dimension code constructions. Since Constructions A–C are defined for $d = k - 1$ and $d = 2$ we will only cover these two cases. The largest previously known general construction with a closed cardinality formula is the multicomponent construction [8], [21]. This construction is a special case of the multilevel construction of [3] (see Section II), where we require the k ones in the identifying vectors to be in one block of length k. Then the arising Ferrers diagrams are full rectangles and can be filled with an MRD code. A closed cardinality formula for this construction was derived in [21, Theorem 2.9] as

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n-2k}{d} \rfloor} q^{(k-d+1)(n-k-di)} + \sum_{i=\lfloor \frac{n-2k}{d} \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor \frac{n-k}{d} \rfloor} \lceil q^{k(n-k+1-d(i+1))} \rceil \tag{5}$$

In the following lemma we compare our Construction A with the multicomponent construction and give a lower bound on the difference between the respective cardinalities. The proof of the lemma can be found in Appendix C.

Lemma 41. *Let $n \geq \frac{k^2+3k-2}{2}$. Let C_A be an $(n, |C_A|, d = k-1, k)$ code obtained by Construction A and let C_{MC} be an $(n, |C_{MC}|, d = k-1, k)$ code obtained by the multicomponent construction. Then*

$$|C_A| - |C_{MC}| > q^{2n-k^2-k+1}.$$

In the following lemma we compare the cardinality of a code obtained by Construction B with the cardinality of a code obtained by the multicomponent construction. The proof of the lemma can be found in Appendix D.

Lemma 42. *Let $n \geq 2k+2$. Let C_B be an $(n, |C_A|, d = 2, k)$ code obtained by Construction B and let C_{MC} be an $(n, |C_{MC}|, d = 2, k)$ code obtained by the multicomponent construction. Then*

$$|C_B| - |C_{MC}| > q^{(k-1)(n-k)-8}.$$

In the following lemma we provide a comparison between Construction B and Construction C. For simplicity, we only consider the case $k = 4, q = 2$ and even n, but for $k = 5$ and general q, n the statement is similar. The proof of the lemma can be found in Appendix E.

Lemma 43. *Let $q = 2$ and $n \geq 10$ be an even number. Let C_B be an $(n, |C_B|, 2, 4)_2$ code obtained by Construction B and let C_C be an $(n, |C_C|, 2, 4)_2$ code obtained by Construction C-4. Then*

$$|C_C| - |C_B| \geq 3 \cdot 2^{3n-20}.$$

Note that since the cardinality of a code obtained by Construction D depends on the choice of the base code, we cannot provide a closed cardinality formula and hence also no analytical comparison of Construction D with other known constructions.

If we do not require a closed cardinality formula, the largest known codes for most parameter sets arise from the multilevel construction with a lexicode as the set of identifying vectors [3]. Tables I – II show some examples of code cardinalities of the different constructions from this paper compared to the multilevel construction and the multicomponent construction. The bold value for each line shows the largest cardinality for the given parameters.

For Construction A we use the cardinality formula of Theorem 19, for Construction B the formula of Theorem 26. For the values of Construction C we use the formulas of Theorems 32 and 35, for $k = 4$ and $k = 5$ respectively. For Construction D we use the respective multilevel codes (see [3]) of length $2k$ (i.e., $\Delta = n - 2k$), and the $(8, 4797, 2, 4)$ code from [4], as the old code from which we construct a new code. The cardinality formula for Construction D can be found in Theorem 37.

All the $(n, M, d, k)_q$ codes presented in these tables contain a lifted MRD code of size $q^{(n-k)(k-d+1)}$, so the cardinalities of the constructed codes are written in the form $q^{(n-k)(k-d+1)} + (M - q^{(n-k)(k-d+1)})$.

$(n, d, k)_q$	A	D	multilevel	multicomponent
$(13, 3, 4)_2$	$\mathbf{2^{18} + 4747}$	$2^{18} + 4096$	$2^{18} + 4357$	$2^{18} + 4113$
$(14, 3, 4)_2$	$\mathbf{2^{20} + 19051}$	$2^{20} + 16384$	$2^{20} + 17204$	$2^{20} + 16641$
$(15, 3, 4)_2$	$\mathbf{2^{22} + 76331}$	$2^{22} + 65536$	$2^{22} + 68378$	$2^{22} + 66561$
$(19, 4, 5)_2$	$\mathbf{2^{28} + 1067627}$	$2^{28} + 1048576$	$2^{28} + 1052778$	$2^{28} + 1052673$
$(20, 4, 5)_2$	$\mathbf{2^{30} + 4270635}$	$2^{30} + 4194304$	$2^{30} + 4211044$	$2^{30} + 4210689$
$(19, 4, 5)_3$	$\mathbf{3^{28} + 3491666833}$	$3^{28} + 3486784401$	$3^{28} + 3487316403$	$3^{28} + 3487315843$
$(20, 4, 5)_3$	$\mathbf{3^{30} + 31425002590}$	$3^{30} + 31381059639$	$3^{30} + 31385846853$	$3^{30} + 31385842579$

TABLE I: Comparison of cardinalities of codes constructed according to Constructions A and D with the multilevel and the multicomponent construction.

$(n, d, k)_q$	B	C	D	multilevel	multicomponent
$(10, 2, 4)_2$	$2^{18} + 21861$	$\mathbf{2^{18} + 37477}$	–	$2^{18} + 35685$	$2^{18} + 4113$
$(11, 2, 4)_2$	$2^{21} + 175024$	$\mathbf{2^{21} + 293200}$	–	$2^{21} + 285889$	$2^{21} + 33025$
$(12, 2, 4)_2$	$2^{24} + 1402877$	$2^{24} + 2338365$	$\mathbf{2^{24} + 2871296}$	$2^{24} + 2290845$	$2^{24} + 266257$
$(13, 2, 4)_2$	$2^{27} + 11221585$	$2^{27} + 18517073$	$\mathbf{2^{27} + 22970368}$	$2^{27} + 18328921$	$2^{27} + 2130177$
$(12, 2, 5)_2$	$2^{28} + 19009577$	$2^{28} + 29377577$	–	$\mathbf{2^{28} + 30877839}$	$2^{28} + 1049601$
$(13, 2, 5)_2$	$2^{32} + 304223372$	$2^{32} + 447026316$	–	$\mathbf{2^{32} + 494999563}$	$2^{32} + 16810017$
$(15, 2, 5)_2$	$2^{40} + 77883166687$	$2^{40} + 113061122015$	$2^{40} + 124519448576$	$\mathbf{2^{40} + 126773908793}$	$2^{40} + 4311777313$
$(16, 2, 5)_2$	$2^{44} + 1246130688803$	$2^{44} + 1903760855843$	$2^{44} + 1992311177216$	$\mathbf{2^{44} + 2028469279328}$	$2^{44} + 68988961793$

TABLE II: Comparison of cardinalities of codes constructed according to Constructions B, C-4, C-5, and D with the multilevel and the multicomponent construction.

One can see that Construction A always results in the largest cardinality for a valid set of parameters (remember that Construction A is only defined for $d = k-1$). Furthermore, Construction C-4 beats the multilevel construction, whereas Construction C-5 does not for the parameter sets we used. Moreover, Construction D yields the largest known $(12, 2, 4)_2$ and $(13, 2, 4)_2$ codes. Note that Construction D is not defined for the parameters $(n, k) \in \{(10, 4), (11, 4), (12, 5), (13, 5)\}$, since $\Delta = n - 2k < k$ in these cases.

Overall, our new constructions presented in this paper beat the known constructions for many sets of parameters. Note that, by construction, we cannot expect Construction B to improve on the cardinality of the multilevel

construction. We still wanted to describe this construction to derive a closed cardinality formula, in contrast to the multilevel construction, for which no such formula exists.

VII. Non-Constant Dimension Codes

In this section we consider codes in $\mathcal{P}_q(n)$ which are not constant dimension codes. Constructions of such codes were considered for the subspace metric in [3], [16] and for the injection metric in [16]. A code in the projective space can be considered as a union of constant dimension codes with different dimensions. Moreover, a construction of a code in $\mathcal{P}_q(n)$ can be done in a multilevel manner, i.e., first, the identifying vectors of the subspaces are chosen and then the corresponding lifted Ferrers diagrams rank-metric codes are constructed [3], [16]. For this recall Proposition 1, which states that for any $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_q(n)$,

$$d_S(X,Y) \geq d_H(v(X), v(Y)),$$
$$d_I(X,Y) \geq d_{asym}(v(X), v(Y)).$$

One can easily see that the largest constant dimension component of the final code is of dimension $k = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Hence, to construct a code in the projective space one can start by first choosing a constant dimension code with the minimum injection distance d in $\mathcal{G}_q(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor, n)$, then add codes with the same minimum distance in $\mathcal{G}_q(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \pm d, n)$, then in $\mathcal{G}_q(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \pm 2d, n)$, etc. The union is a projective space code in $\mathcal{P}_q(n)$ with minimum distance d. This is independent of the underlying metric, i.e., it works for both the subspace and the injection distance.

We will show that by using the codes (lower bounds) obtained in the previous sections, one can provide new large codes in the projective space (and hence new lower bounds), for both the subspace and the injection metric. To provide large codes in projective spaces we use the puncturing approach, presented in [3]. Although the puncturing method was proposed for the subspace metric, we show that when applied on large constant dimension codes, it results in large codes also for the injection metric. This shows that puncturing is a powerful method to construct large codes for the injection metric as well.

First, we briefly describe the puncturing method presented in [3]. Let $X \in \mathcal{G}_q(k,n)$ be a subspace which does not contain the ith unit vector vector $e_i \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$. The i-coordinate puncturing of X, denoted by $\Gamma_i(X)$, is the subspace in $\mathcal{G}_q(k, n-1)$ obtained from X by deleting the ith coordinate from each vector of X. Let $1 \leq \tau \leq n$ be the unique zero position of $v(Q)$, for a given $Q \in \mathcal{G}_q(n-1,n)$ and let $v \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ such that $v \notin Q$. Let $\mathbb{C}$ be an $(n, M, d)_q^S$ code in $\mathcal{P}_q(n)$ of subspace distance d, such that there exist codewords $X_1, X_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ with $X_1 \subseteq Q$ and $v \in X_2$. Then the *punctured* code $\mathbb{C}'_{Q,v}$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{C}'_{Q,v} = \quad & \{\Gamma_\tau(X) : X \in \mathbb{C}, X \subseteq Q\} \cup \\ & \{\Gamma_\tau(X \cap Q) : X \in \mathbb{C}, v \in X\},\end{aligned}$$

is a code in $\mathcal{P}_q(n-1)$ with minimum subspace distance $d-1$, i.e., an $(n-1, M', d-1)_q^S$ code. If $\mathbb{C}$ is a constant dimension code in $\mathcal{G}_q(k,n)$, then the punctured code contains subspaces of dimensions k and $k-1$.

The following lemma considers the minimum *injection* distance of a punctured code of a constant dimension code.

Lemma 44. *Let $\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{G}_q(k,n)$ be a code with minimum injection distance d, i.e., an $(n, M, d, k)_q$ constant dimension code. Let $Q \in \mathcal{G}_q(n-1,n)$ and $v \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$, $v \notin Q$, such that there exist two codewords $X_1, X_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ with $X_1 \subseteq Q$ and $v \in X_2$. Then the punctured code $\mathbb{C}'_{Q,v}$ has minimum injection distance d, i.e., it is an $(n-1, M', d)_q^I$ code.*

Proof: Since for any two subspaces X, Y of the same dimension it holds that $d_I(X,Y) = d_S(X,Y)/2$, it is sufficient to check two subspaces $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}'_{Q,v}$ of different dimensions k and $k-1$:

$$\begin{aligned} d_I(X,Y) &= k - \dim(X \cap Y) = \frac{2k - 2\dim(X \cap Y)}{2} \\ &= \frac{d_S(X,Y)+1}{2} \geq \frac{(2d-1)+1}{2} = d. \end{aligned}$$

■

The lower bound on the cardinality of the punctured code is given in the following theorem [3]:

Theorem 45. *If $\mathbb{C}$ is an $(n, M, d, k)_q$ constant dimension code then there exists an $(n-1)$-dimensional subspace Q and a vector $v \notin Q$, such that*

$$|\mathbb{C}'_{Q,v}| \geq M\frac{q^{n-k}+q^k-2}{q^n-1}.$$

Now we present a construction for codes in the projective space. This construction generalizes the constructions for non-constant dimension codes from [3], [16].

Construction of codes in projective space. Let $\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{G}_q(\lfloor\frac{n+1}{2}\rfloor, n+1)$ be a constant dimension code of minimum injection distance $d_I = d$. Let $\mathbb{C}'$ be the code obtained by puncturing $\mathbb{C}$. $\mathbb{C}'$ contains subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ of dimensions $\lfloor\frac{n+1}{2}\rfloor$ and $\lfloor\frac{n+1}{2}\rfloor - 1$ and has minimum subspace distance $2d-1$ and minimum injection distance d, by Lemma 44.

- For the injection metric, we add to $\mathbb{C}'$ the codewords of the largest known constant dimension codes with minimum injection distance d from $\mathcal{G}_q(\lfloor\frac{n+1}{2}\rfloor - 1 - id, n)$, for $i = 1, \ldots, \lfloor\frac{\lfloor\frac{n+1}{2}\rfloor - 1}{d}\rfloor$ and from $\mathcal{G}_q(\lfloor\frac{n+1}{2}\rfloor + id, n)$, for $i = 1, \ldots, \lfloor\frac{n-\lfloor\frac{n+1}{2}\rfloor}{d}\rfloor$. The resulting code $\widetilde{\mathbb{C}_I}$ is a code in $\mathcal{P}_q(n)$ with minimum injection distance d.
- For the subspace metric, we add to $\mathbb{C}'$ the codewords of the largest known constant dimension codes with minimum subspace distance $2d$ from $\mathcal{G}_q(\lfloor\frac{n+1}{2}\rfloor - 1 - i(2d-1), n)$, for $i = 1, \ldots, \lfloor\frac{\lfloor\frac{n+1}{2}\rfloor - 1}{2d-1}\rfloor$ and from $\mathcal{G}_q(\lfloor\frac{n+1}{2}\rfloor + i(2d-1), n)$, for $i = 1, \ldots, \lfloor\frac{n-\lfloor\frac{n+1}{2}\rfloor}{2d-1}\rfloor$. The resulting code $\widetilde{\mathbb{C}_S}$ is a code in $\mathcal{P}_q(n)$ with minimum subspace distance $2d-1$.

Remark 46. The cardinality of the code obtained by the above construction is lower bounded by using the results from the previous sections and by Theorem 45.

We illustrate the idea of the construction for projective space codes based on the puncturing method, for both the subspace and the injection metric, in the following example.

Example 47. Let $q = 2$ and $n = 11$. First, let $\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{G}_2(6, 12)$ be a constant dimension code with minimum injection distance $d_I = 2$ and size 1196288829, obtained by the multilevel construction [3]. By puncturing it, we can obtain a code in $\mathcal{P}_2(11)$ of size at least 36808900 (by Theorem 45), which includes subspaces of dimensions 5 and 6 of $\mathbb{F}_2^{11}$, and has minimum subspace distance $d_S = 3$ and minimum injection distance $d_I = 2$.

1) We add the codewords of constant dimension codes with minimum injection distance 2 from $\mathcal{G}_2(1, 11)$, $\mathcal{G}_2(3, 11)$, $\mathcal{G}_2(8, 11)$, $\mathcal{G}_2(10, 11)$ of sizes 1, 76331, 76331, 1, respectively. The final code $\widetilde{\mathbb{C}_I}$ has minimum injection distance $d_I = 2$ (and subspace distance $d_S = 2$) and size $|\widetilde{\mathbb{C}_I}| = 36961564$, such that $\log(|\widetilde{\mathbb{C}_I}|) = 25.1395$ (compare to 24.63210 in [15]).
2) We add the codewords of constant dimension codes with minimum injection distance 2 from $\mathcal{G}_2(2, 11)$, $\mathcal{G}_2(9, 11)$ of size 681 each. The final code $\widetilde{\mathbb{C}_S}$ has minimum subspace distance $d_S = 3$ (and injection distance $d_I = 2$) and size $|\widetilde{\mathbb{C}_S}| = 36810200$, such that $\log(|\widetilde{\mathbb{C}_S}|) = 25.1336$.

Table III shows some examples of cardinalities of our codes based on puncturing (for both the subspace and the injection metric) in $\mathcal{P}_q(n)$ compared to the codes of [15] (for the injection metric), for $q = 2$. To make the comparison easier we present the cardinalities in the logarithmic form.

One can see that for odd n our codes are larger than the known ones, while for even n this is not the case.

n	d_S	$\log(\widetilde{\mathbb{C}_S})$	d_I	$\log(\widetilde{\mathbb{C}_I})$	$\log(\widetilde{\mathbb{C}})$ from [15]
11	3	25.1336	2	**25.1395**	24.6321
11	5	18.9806	3	**18.9806**	18.0298
12	3	29.728	2	29.7586	**30.3372**
12	5	20.6101	3	20.6107	**24.0054**
13	3	36.1454	2	**36.1511**	35.6303
13	5	28.9917	3	**28.9924**	28.0265
14	3	41.7352	2	41.7651	**42.33625**
14	5	33.5804	3	33.5806	**35.00464**

TABLE III: Comparison of cardinalities of our codes in $\mathcal{P}_q(n)$ based on puncturing with the codes in [15] .

VIII. Conclusion and Open Problems

In this work we presented new constructions for constant dimension codes, and based on these also new constructions for non-constant dimension codes. To do so we used the known techniques of the multilevel construction and pending dots, as well as new results on Ferrers diagrams arising from matchings of the complete graph. Moreover, we derived a way of constructing new codes from old codes. The new constructions give rise to the largest known codes for most sets of parameters, as shown in the tables of Section VI and VII. This means that these codes have the best known transmission rate for a given error-correction capability.

For future research it would be interesting to derive bounds analogous to the one of Theorem 11 for other values of d, and see if any of our constructions attain such a bound (asymptotically). Furthermore, we would like to develop results of Ferrers diagrams rank metric codes related to the complete graph for codes of minimum rank distance $d \neq 2$, and investigate if we could use such results for constant dimension code constructions with minimum injection distance d (and respective non-constant dimension codes).

Another open question is how these codes can be decoded efficiently. Due to their similarity to the multilevel construction the codes constructed by our new constructions can be decoded with an analogous decoding algorithm but the structure of the identifying vectors might be useful and could be exploited for a more efficient algorithm.

Appendix

A. Proof of Lemma 31

Proof: We will prove the first statement for n' even and $i \leq \frac{n'}{2}$. The other statements can be proven analogously.

Let us look at the graph of the proof of Theorem 29 again, labeled as mentioned before. Choose some center edge (n', i) where $i \leq \frac{n'}{2}$. Remember that (n', i) corresponds to the length n' binary vector with a 1 in positions i and n' and zeros elsewhere. Hence the arising Ferrers diagram has only one row with exactly $(n' - i - 1)$ many dots.

Now we look at all edges whose smaller entry i' satisfies $1 \leq i' < i$. Such an edge will always be of the form $(i - j, i + j)$ for $1 \leq j < i$, thus there are $(i - 1)$ of these edges. One can see by induction that all of these edges give rise to Ferrers diagrams of the same size, since a FD corresponding to $(x - 1, y + 1)$ can be obtained from the FD corresponding to (x, y) by adding a point in the first row and deleting a point in the second row. We can count the dots e.g. in the FD corresponding to $(1, 2i - 1)$: There are $n' - 2$ dots in the first row and $n' - (2i - 1)$ in the second, hence a sum of $2n' - 2i - 1$ dots for the whole FD.

The edges that are left are of the form $(\frac{n'}{2} + i - 1 - j, \frac{n'}{2} + i + j)$ for $0 \leq j < \frac{n'}{2} - i$. With the same argument as in the paragraph before, all of these FD have the same number of dots and there are $\frac{n'}{2} - i$ many of them. We can count the dots in the FD arising from $(i, n' - 1 + i)$: There are $n' - 1 - i$ dots in the first row and $n' - (n' - 1 + i)$ in the second, hence a sum of $n' - 2i$ dots for the whole FD. ∎

B. Proof of the cardinalities in Theorems 32 and 35

Proof: We derive the cardinalities of each component of the set of identifying vectors from Theorems 32 and 35.

Let n be even. The FDRM code with rank distance $d = 2$ arising from the identifying vectors of

- $\mathcal{A}_1^4$ has cardinality $(q^{(n-4)} + q^{(n-6)})(q^{2(n-6)} + (\frac{n}{2} - 4)q^{(n-7)} + q^{(\frac{n}{2}-4)})$.
- $\mathcal{A}_2^4$ has cardinality $(q^{(n-5)} + q^{(n-6)})(\left(\frac{n}{2} - 4\right) q^{(n-8)} + q^{(2n-13)} + q^{(n-7)})$.
- $\mathcal{A}_3^4$ has cardinality $(q^{(n-5)} + q^{(n-6)}) \times$
  $\Big[\sum_{i=2}^{\lceil \frac{q}{2} \rceil + 1} (iq^{2n-2i-10} + (\frac{n-6}{2} - i)q^{n-2i-5} + q^{\frac{n-6}{2}-i}) +$
  $\sum_{i=2}^{\lfloor \frac{q}{2} \rfloor + 1} (iq^{2n-2i-11} + (\frac{n-6}{2} - i)q^{n-2i-6} + q^{n-i-6})\Big]$.
- $\mathcal{A}_1^5$ has cardinality $(q^{2n-10} + q^{2n-14})(q^{2(n-7)} + (\frac{n-8}{2})q^{(n-9)})$.
- $\mathcal{A}_2^5$ has cardinality $(q^{2n-11} + q^{2n-13})(\frac{n-8}{2}q^{(n-10)} + q^{(2n-15)})$.
- $\mathcal{A}_3^5$ has cardinality $(q^{2n-12} + q^{2n-13})(2q^{2(n-8)} + \frac{n-10}{2}q^{(n-11)})$.
- $\mathcal{A}_4^5$ has cardinality $(q^{2n-12} + q^{2n-14})(\frac{n-10}{2}q^{(n-12)} + 2q^{(2n-17)})$.

- $\mathcal{A}_5^5$ has cardinality $(q^{2n-12}+q^{2n-14})\times$
$\Big[\sum_{i=3}^{\lceil \frac{q}{2}\rceil+2}(iq^{2n-2i-12}+(\frac{n-6}{2}-i)q^{n-2i-7})+$
$\sum_{i=3}^{\lfloor \frac{q}{2}\rfloor+2}(iq^{2n-2i-13}+(\frac{n-6}{2}-i)q^{n-2i-8})\Big]$.

Let n be odd. The FDRM code with rank distance $d=2$ arising from the identifying vectors of

- $\mathcal{A}_1^4$ has cardinality $(q^{(n-4)}+q^{(n-6)})(q^{2(n-6)}+(\frac{n-3}{2})q^{(n-8)})$.
- $\mathcal{A}_2^4$ has cardinality $(q^{(n-5)}+q^{(n-6)})(\frac{n-3}{2}q^{n-9}+q^{2n-13})$.
- $\mathcal{A}_3^4$ has cardinality $(q^{(n-5)}+q^{(n-6)})\times$
$\Big[\sum_{i=2}^{\lceil \frac{q}{2}\rceil+1}(iq^{2n-2i-10}+(\frac{n-5}{2}-i)q^{n-2i-6})+$
$\sum_{i=2}^{\lfloor \frac{q}{2}\rfloor+1}(iq^{2n-2i-11}+(\frac{n-5}{2}-i)q^{n-2i-7})\Big]$.
- $\mathcal{A}_1^5$ has cardinality $(q^{2n-10}+q^{2n-14})(q^{2n-14}+(\frac{n-9}{2})q^{(n-8)}+q^{\frac{n-9}{2}})$.
- $\mathcal{A}_2^5$ has cardinality $(q^{2n-11}+q^{2n-13})(\frac{n-9}{2}q^{(n-9)}+q^{(2n-15)}+q^{n-8})$.
- $\mathcal{A}_3^5$ has cardinality $(q^{2n-12}+q^{2n-13})(q^{2n-16}+(\frac{n-11}{2})q^{(n-10)}+q^{\frac{n-11}{2}})$.
- $\mathcal{A}_4^5$ has cardinality $(q^{2n-12}+q^{2n-14})(\frac{n-11}{2}q^{(n-11)}+2q^{(2n-17)}+q^{n-9})$.
- $\mathcal{A}_5^5$ has cardinality $(q^{2n-14}+q^{2n-12})\times$
$\Big[\sum_{i=3}^{\lceil \frac{q}{2}\rceil+2}(iq^{2n-12}+(\frac{n-7}{2}-i)q^{n-2i-6}+q^{\frac{n-7}{2}-i})+$
$\sum_{i=3}^{\lfloor \frac{q}{2}\rfloor+2}(iq^{2n-2i-13}+(\frac{n-7}{2}-i)q^{n-2i-7}+q^{n-i-7})\Big]$.

These formulas imply the cardinality formulas of Theorems 32 and 35 by summing them up and adding the largest known code of length $n-k$ with zeros appended in front. Note that when summing them up we can merge the cardinalities of $\mathcal{A}_2^4$ and $\mathcal{A}_3^4$, as well as $\mathcal{A}_4^5$ and $\mathcal{A}_5^5$, respectively. An index shift in the second sums results in the formulas of Theorems 32 and 35. ■

C. Proof of Lemma 41

Proof: Let $s=\sum_{i=3}^{k} i$ be as defined in Construction A and let $n':=n-s$. According to Construction A and by Theorem 19 we have that the part of the code corresponding to the identifying vectors in $\mathcal{A}_0^k\cup\{v_{00}^k\}$, denoted by C_{A0}, is of cardinality $q^{2(n-k)}+q^{2(n-(k+(k-1)))}+\ldots+q^{2(n'+3)}+q^{2n'}$ and the cardinality of $C_A\setminus C_{A0}$ is $\begin{bmatrix} n' \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q$.

The number of identifying vectors for C_{A0} is $k-2$. Let N_s be the set of identifying vectors for the multicomponent construction with the first nonzero coordinate in the first $s=n-n'$ positions. Then $|N_s|=\lceil\frac{n-n'}{k-1}\rceil=\lceil\frac{k^2+k-6}{2(k-1)}\rceil\leq k-2$, for $k\geq 5$. Hence, $|N_s|$ is at most the number of identifying vectors for C_{A0}. Denote the subcode of C_{MC} corresponding to the identifying vectors in N_s by C_{MC}^s. Then

$$|C_{MC}^s|=q^{2(n-k)}+q^{2(n-2k+1)}+q^{2(n-3k+2)}+q^{2(n-4k+3)}+\ldots$$

and

$$|C_{A0}|=q^{2(n-k)}+q^{2(n-2k+1)}+q^{2(n-3k+3)}+q^{2(n-4k+6)}+\ldots$$

Since the number of summands in the former is at most the number of summands in the latter, we get that $|C_{MC}^s|\leq|C_{A0}|$.

Now we consider the identifying vectors of $C_{MC}^{n'}:=C_{MC}\backslash C_{MC}^s$, i.e. the identifying vectors with all nonzero entries contained in the last n' coordinates. Let $x:=\left\lfloor\frac{n'-k}{k-1}\right\rfloor+1=\left\lfloor\frac{n'-1}{k-1}\right\rfloor$ be an upper bound on the number of identifying vectors in $C_{MC}^{n'}$. Then

$$|C_{MC}^{n'}|\leq\sum_{i=0}^{x-1}q^{2(n'-k-i(k-1))}=\sum_{i=1}^{x}q^{2(n'-1-i(k-1))}$$

$$=q^{2(n'-1)}\sum_{i=1}^{x}q^{-2i(k-1)}=q^{2(n'-1)-2x(k-1)}\frac{(q^{2x(k-1)}-1)}{(q^{2(k-1)}-1)}$$

$$\leq q^{2(n'-1)-2(k-1)+1}=q^{2n'-2k+1}.$$

Then

$$|C_A \setminus C_{A0}| - |C_{MC}^{n'}| \geq \begin{bmatrix} n' \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q - q^{2n'-2k+1}$$
$$\geq q^{2n'-4} - q^{2n'-2k+1} = q^{2n'-2k+1}(q^{2k-5}-1).$$

Hence,

$$|C_A| - |C_{MC}| \geq q^{2n'-2k+1}(q^{2k-5}-1) > q^{2n'-2k+1}q^{2k-6}$$
$$> q^{2n'-5} = q^{2n-k^2-k+1},$$

and the statement of the lemma follows for $k \geq 5$.

For $k = 4$, $\mathcal{A}_0^4 \cup \{v_{00}^4\}$ contains only two different identifying vectors which are identical to the first two vectors of C_{MC}. Now we consider the identifying vectors of C_{MC} with all nonzero entries contained in the last $n'+1$ coordinates. Note that with the first two identifying vectors these vectors are all the vectors of C_{MC}. We denote by $C_{MC}^{n'+1}$ the part of the code C_{MC} which corresponds to these vectors. Denote by $x := \lfloor \frac{n'}{3} \rfloor$ an upper bound on the number of identifying vectors in $C_{MC}^{n'+1}$. Then

$$|C_{MC}^{n'+1}| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{x} q^{2(n'-3i)} = q^{2n'} \sum_{i=1}^{x} q^{-6i}$$
$$= q^{2n'-6x} \frac{(q^{6x}-1)}{(q^6-1)} \leq q^{2n'-5}.$$

Then

$$|C_A| - |C_{MC}| = |C_A \setminus C_{A0}| - |C_{MC}^{n'+1}| \geq \begin{bmatrix} n' \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}_q - q^{2n'-5}$$
$$\geq q^{2n'-4} - q^{2n'-5} = q^{2n'-5}(q-1) \geq q^{2n'-5} = q^{2n-k^2-k+1}$$

and the statement of the lemma follows for $k = 4$. ∎

D. Proof of Lemma 42

Proof: By equation (5), the cardinality of the code C_{MC} obtained by the multicomponent construction with distance $d = 2$ is upper bounded by

$$|C_{MC}| \leq A_q^*(n-k,2,k) + \sum_{i=0}^{\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil - 1} q^{(k-1)(n-k-2i)}$$
$$= A_q^*(n-k,2,k) + q^{(k-1)(n-k)} + q^{(k-1)(n-k)} \sum_{i=1}^{\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil - 1} q^{-2(k-1)i}$$
$$= A_q^*(n-k,2,k) + q^{(k-1)(n-k)} +$$
$$q^{(k-1)(n-k)} \frac{q^{2(k-1)(\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil - 1)} - 1}{q^{2(k-1)(\lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil - 1)}(q^{2(k-1)} - 1)}$$
$$< A_q^*(n-k,2,k) + q^{(k-1)(n-k)} + q^{(k-1)(n-k-2)+1}$$
$$= A_q^*(n-k,2,k) + q^{(k-1)(n-k)} + q^{(k-1)(n-k)-2k+3}.$$

On the other hand, by Theorem 26, the cardinality of C_B is bounded by

$$|C_B| \geq A_q^*(n-k,2,k) + q^{(k-1)(n-k)} +$$
$$q^{(k-1)(n-k)-4} + q^{(k-3)(n-k)-4+4\lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor - 4 + 2\epsilon(n-k)} + Z$$
$$= A_q^*(n-k,2,k) + q^{(k-1)(n-k)} + q^{(k-1)(n-k)-4}$$

$$+q^{(k-1)(n-k)-8}+Z,$$

where

$$Z=\left(\sum_{i=2}^{\lfloor\frac{k-3}{2}\rfloor}q^{(k-3)(n-k)-4i}+\epsilon(k-1)q^{(k-3)(n-k-2)}\right)\times\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor\frac{n-k}{2}\rfloor-2}q^{2(2i+\epsilon(n-k))}>0.$$

Hence,

$$|C_B|-|C_{MC}|\geq Z+q^{(k-1)(n-k)-8}>q^{(k-1)(n-k)-8}.$$

■

E. Proof of Lemma 43

Proof: First, by Theorem 26, for the given parameters we have

$$\begin{aligned}|C_B|-2^{3(n-4)}-A_q^*(n-4,2,4)&=(2^{n-4}+2^{n-6})\sum_{i=0}^{\frac{n-4}{2}-1}2^{4i}\\&=(2^{n-4}+2^{n-6})\frac{2^{2n-8}-1}{2^4-1}\\&\leq(2^{n-4}+2^{n-6})\frac{2^{2n-8}}{2^4-1}=\frac{2^{3n-12}+2^{3n-14}}{15}.\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 32 we have

$$\begin{aligned}&|C_C|-2^{3(n-4)}-A_q^*(n-4,2,4)=\\&(2^{n-4}+2^{n-6})\left(2^{2n-12}+(\frac{n}{2}-4)2^{n-7}+2^{\frac{n}{2}-4}\right)+\\&(2^{n-5}+2^{n-6})\Big(2^{2n-13}+\frac{n-10}{2}2^{n-9}+2^{\frac{n-10}{2}}+2^{2n-14}\\&+\frac{n-10}{2}2^{n-10}+2^{n-8}+2^{2n-13}+\frac{n-8}{2}2^{n-8}+2^{n-7}\Big)\\&=2^{3n-15}+2^{3n-20}+2^{3n-19}+X,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}X=&(2^{n-4}+2^{n-6})\left((\frac{n}{2}-4)2^{n-7}+2^{\frac{n}{2}-4}\right)+\\&(2^{n-5}+2^{n-6})\left(\frac{n-10}{2}(2^{n-9}+2^{n-10})+2^{\frac{n-10}{2}}\right.\\&\left.+\frac{n-6}{2}2^{n-8}+2^{n-7}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Now we find a lower bound on X. For $n\geq 10$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}X&\geq\left(2^{n-4}+2^{n-6}\right)\left(2^{n-7}+2\right)\\&+\left(2^{n-5}+2^{n-6}\right)\left(2^{n-7}+2^{n-7}\right)\\&\geq\left(2^{n-4}+2^{n-6}\right)2^{n-7}+\left(2^{n-5}+2^{n-6}\right)2^{n-6}\\&=2\cdot2^{2n-11}+2^{2n-12}+2^{2n-13}\geq2^{2n-10}.\end{aligned}$$

Since it holds that

$$2^{3n-15}\geq\frac{2^{3n-12}+2^{3n-14}}{15}=\frac{1}{3}2^{3n-14},$$

it follows that

$$|C_C|-|C_B|\geq X+2^{3n-20}+2^{3n-19}\geq3\cdot2^{3n-20},$$

which implies the statement. ■

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to thank Tuvi Etzion and Antonia Wachter-Zeh for many helpful discussions. They also thank Joachim Rosenthal for hosting the first author at the University of Zurich, where part of this work was done.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Kötter and F. R. Kschischang, "Coding for errors and erasures in random network coding," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 3579–3591, 2008.
[2] M. Bossert and E. Gabidulin, "One family of algebraic codes for network coding," in *Information Theory, 2009. ISIT 2009. IEEE International Symposium on*, 2009, pp. 2863–2866.
[3] T. Etzion and N. Silberstein, "Error-correcting codes in projective spaces via rank-metric codes and Ferrers diagrams," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 2909–2919, March 2009.
[4] ——, "Codes and designs related to lifted MRD codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 1004 –1017, 2013.
[5] T. Etzion and A. Vardy, "Error-correcting codes in projective space," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 1165–1173, 2011. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2010.2095232
[6] N. Silberstein and T. Etzion, "Enumerative coding for grassmannian space," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 365–374, 2011.
[7] ——, "Large constant dimension codes and lexicodes," *Adv. in Math. of Comm.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 177–189, 2011.
[8] E. M. Gabidulin and N. I. Pilipchuk, "Multicomponent network coding," in *Proceedings of the Seventh International Workshop on Coding and Cryptography (WCC) 2011*, Paris, France, 2011, pp. 443–452.
[9] M. Gadouleau and Z. Yan, "Constant-rank codes and their connection to constant-dimension codes," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 7, pp. 3207–3216, 2010.
[10] A. Khaleghi and F. R. Kschischang, "Projective space codes for the injection metric," *arXiv:0904.0813v1 [cs.IT]*, 2009.
[11] A. Kohnert and S. Kurz, "Construction of large constant dimension codes with a prescribed minimum distance," in *MMICS*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, J. Calmet, W. Geiselmann, and J. Müller-Quade, Eds., vol. 5393. Springer, 2008, pp. 31–42.
[12] F. Manganiello, E. Gorla, and J. Rosenthal, "Spread codes and spread decoding in network coding," in *Proceedings of the 2008 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, Toronto, Canada, 2008, pp. 851–855.
[13] V. Skachek, "Recursive code construction for random networks," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 1378–1382, 2010.
[14] A.-L. Trautmann and J. Rosenthal, "New improvements on the echelon-Ferrers construction," in *Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems – MTNS*, Budapest, Hungary, 2010, pp. 405–408.
[15] A. Khaleghi, "Projective space codes for the injection metric," Masters Thesis, University of Toronto, 2009.
[16] A. Khaleghi, D. Silva, and F. R. Kschischang, "Subspace codes," in *IMA Int. Conf.*, 2009, pp. 1–21.
[17] D. Silva, F. R. Kschischang, and R. Kötter, "A rank-metric approach to error control in random network coding," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 3951 –3967, 2008.
[18] A.-L. Trautmann, F. Manganiello, and J. Rosenthal, "Orbit codes - a new concept in the area of network coding," in *IEEE Information Theory Workshop (ITW)*, Dublin, Ireland, 2010, pp. 1–4.
[19] A. Beutelspacher, "Partial spreads in finite projective spaces and partial designs," *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, vol. 145, no. 3, pp. 211–229, 1975.
[20] E. Gorla and A. Ravagnani, "Partial spreads in random network coding," *Finite Fields and Their Applications*, vol. 26, pp. 104–115, 2014.
[21] A.-L. Trautmann, "Constructions, decoding and automorphisms of subspace codes," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Zurich, Switzerland, 2013.
[22] E. M. Gabidulin, "Theory of codes with maximum rank distance," *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 3–16, 1985.
[23] R. Roth, "Maximum-rank array codes and their application to crisscross error correction," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 328 –336, mar 1991.
[24] W. T. Tutte, *Graph theory*, ser. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company Advanced Book Program, 1984, vol. 21, with a foreword by C. St. J. A. Nash-Williams.
[25] J. H. van Lint and R. M. Wilson, *A Course in Combinatorics*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
[26] H. Wang, C. Xing, and R. Safavi-Naini, "Linear authentication codes: bounds and constructions," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 866–872, April 2003.
[27] S.-T. Xia and F.-W. Fu, "Johnson type bounds on constant dimension codes," *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 163–172, 2009.
[28] A. Wachter-Zeh and A. Zeh, "Interpolation-based decoding of interleaved gabidulin codes," in *Preproceedings of the International Workshop on Coding and Cryptography (WCC) 2013*, Bergen, Norway, 2013, pp. 528–538.